

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXII

FEBRUARY, 1931

No. 128

EDITORIAL

THE three articles on the Eucharist which we publish this month illustrate some of the many aspects of the rite which a sound eucharistic theology will endeavour to consider; and Fr. Hebert's article in particular, though it deals with a little-known and somewhat technical matter, touches issues of principle which are of great importance. We shall not, perhaps, be mistaken if we say that the purport of Fr. Hebert's article is similar to that of the liturgical movement associated with Maria-Laach in Germany, viz., to recover the full congregational aspects of the Eucharist. Moreover, there are not wanting encouraging signs, both in the Roman Church and in England, of movement in this direction. In Western Germany, for instance, and in the coast-villages of Brittany the Sunday Eucharist is apt to be a very definitely congregational affair, and where a High Mass is also provided, the parochial *Missa Cantata* tends to be much the more frequented of the two. In our own liturgy, the "Amen" at the close of the Prayer of Consecration is intended to unite the congregation with the action of the celebrant; and many parishes are finding that a Sung Mass, at which there is a real, though not necessarily a general, Communion of the congregation, offers a means of combining the advantages represented so often by the Low Mass and the High Mass in isolation.

We will take this opportunity of drawing attention to two books by Fr. de la Taille, S.J., which have recently reached us. One is *The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion Contrasted and Defined*,* in which the thesis of his long Latin work, *Mysterium Fidei*, is presented in simplified outline, with a number of appended papers on kindred subjects. The other is entitled *The Mystery of Faith*,† and is, in fact, the first chapter of the longer book just alluded to, printed and published separately. The

* Sheed and Ward. 1930. 15s. net.

† Sheed and Ward. 1930. 2s. 6d.

price and the brevity of this little book, which contains only thirty-seven pages in all, will make it the more attractive to our readers, and we strongly recommend the careful study of it. It is packed close with matter and argument, and imports into our thought upon the Eucharist that which most it needs, care in the use of terms. And the result is a doctrine of the Eucharist which is unusually lucid and, if the word may be allowed, complete.

One of the interesting features of Fr. de la Taille's position is its close affinity with that developed by the Master of Corpus in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, and by him and Professor A. E. Taylor and by the present writer in the *Anglo-Catholic Congress Report of 1927*. The fundamental similarity may be illustrated by the following passage from *The Mystery of Faith*, p. 22:

So much as regards the nature of the sacrifice of the Mass and its utilization. What about the precise action by which the holy sacrifice is accomplished? It is not the communion, which being a participation of the Victim of the sacrifice presupposes the sacrifice already accomplished, instead of constituting it. It is not the breaking of the bread, which, far from symbolizing the Passion, originally was but a rite having for its purpose the distribution of the eucharistic repast among the faithful. Neither is it any verbal formula of oblation; for sacrifice is essentially the transfer of a gift, and not the enunciation of that transfer, an oblation in action, and not merely an oblation in words. Neither is it the *Epiclesis*, however august its character, however suitable its place after the commemoration of the Supper. . . . Nothing of all this, impressive though it be, constitutes the sacrifice. What constitutes it is the consecration brought about by the words of Christ and by them alone. So that the *acceptance* of the sacrifice by God, and its *oblation* by man, and the *commemoration* of the Supper and of the Passion of Christ, all are realized at the same instant, and through the effect of the same words.

And again, of the one immolation on the Cross:

We offer that one single immolation, when we present to God the gift of his Body, the Body of the Crucified One, and of his Blood, the Blood of his wounds. But to make of him a Victim, to immolate him effectively as did the Jews, is not our task.

And once more, of the Presence:

He is, both in his being and in his state, beyond the reach of the sacramental operation. His presence alone depends upon it, and that presence puts nothing new into him, although it offers a new term to the relativity of the species, in consequence of the change occurring in the bread.

These passages are sufficient to indicate how much there is in common between Fr. de la Taille and the Anglican school to which we have referred. There are of course, differences. Agree-

ing with him that the sacrifice is constituted by the Consecration, we should not wish to confine the action of Consecration as narrowly as he does to the recitation of the Lord's words of institution. There is a difference also in terminology; for, whereas Fr. de la Taille speaks of the Eucharist as the "oblation" of the sacrifice, we should rather speak of it as its "consecration." We prefer, that is to say, to regard the "oblation" as co-terminous with the whole sacrifice, which includes the immolation as well as the sacerdotal acts which invest the death with its significance, and to use the word "consecration" when this second part of the sacrifice is referred to. And there is an inevitable divergence in that Fr. de la Taille is bound, as we are not, to the concept of Transubstantiation; though the divergence is lessened by his insistence that we should approach the doctrine of the Presence by way of the sacrifice, and not *vice versa*. These, however, are such differences as are inevitable to all serious theological thought. The significant fact is that on so much that is fundamental with regard to the Eucharist Roman and Anglican theologians should be in such close agreement and concord.

CONCELEBRATION

THIS article has been written in order to draw attention to an aspect of the early Church Eucharist which has been little studied in this country; there appears to be no consecutive treatment of the rite of Concelebration at present available in English, except the short summary by Adrian Fortescue in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*.^{*} The greater part of the material here presented is derived directly from the work of French Benedictine scholars.[†]

Concelebration, in the strict sense, is the effective co-operation of several agents in a sacramental rite. It survives throughout the Church in the consecration of bishops, which must ordinarily be effected by the co-operation of three consecrators. The similar rite in the ordination of priests, when priests join with the bishop in the laying-on of hands, can scarcely be regarded as effective co-operation.[‡] It was the ancient custom for several bishops to co-operate in the consecration of a church, and for priests to act with the bishop in blessing chrism and oils.[§]

But we are specially concerned with eucharistic concelebration. This survives in the Roman Church only in the masses at the consecration of a bishop and the ordination of priests; but, as we shall see, it was once the regular practice at solemn mass. In many parts of the Eastern Church, both Orthodox and Uniate, it is a regular usage today; in some cases the concelebrants join with the chief celebrant in saying the eucharistic prayer, except for the formula of consecration, but in other cases they actually co-consecrate. The Uniates had this right confirmed to them by Pope Benedict XIV. in the Constitution *Demandatum* of December 24, 1743.||

THE IDEA UNDERLYING CONCELEBRATION

But the word Concelebration, like the Greek *συλλειτουργεῖν*, can also be used in a wider sense, to cover the part taken also by the deacon and the other ministers; and this brings us to a very

^{*} *Cath. Encyc.*, art. "Concelebration."

[†] Especially Dom P. de Puniet, art. "Concélébration," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (Letouzey, Paris); and a paper read by Dom L. Beauduin at the Eucharistic Congress at Amsterdam, 1924. Dom Beauduin's views have also been published in *Les questions liturgiques et paroissiales*, t. vii., pp. 275-285, and t. viii., pp. 23-34.

[‡] See de Puniet, col. 2483 ff., for a discussion of this point.

[§] *Ibid.*, cols. 2486 f., 2480 f.

|| *Ibid.*, col. 2479 f.; Fortescue, *loc. cit.*

important point, namely, the idea underlying concelebration. Dom de Puniet says:* "It is important to note that in whatever sense the word Concelebration is used, it always carries one idea, that of the unity of the Church. It has often been remarked with what insistence the earliest Christian writers proclaim this principle; the Church herself, in her institutions and her official language, shows a constant concern to affirm the intimate union of her members. One authentic expression of this unity is found in the primitive rule, still observed in the East, which allows one altar only in each church, as there is to be only one bishop and one sacrifice. Thus liturgical functions were plainly declared to be the work of the community, of the whole Church grouped round its Pastor. The officiant was always, in principle at least, the bishop, as the sole depositary of the fulness of priestly power, and representative of Christ the Celebrant *par excellence*, τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός.† But, however primary his rôle in the celebration of the mysteries, the bishop never officiated alone. He had, gathered round him, his priests, deacons, and inferior clergy, all exercising the functions of their rank in virtue of powers derived from himself. Besides this, the ancients had a very definite idea of the part which the faithful themselves took in this concelebration."

The writer is speaking of the corporateness of the act of offering. We do well to add, however, that the same idea of unity found an equally indispensable expression in the fellowship of communion. "The act of communion was from the very beginning the chief expression of Christian fellowship, and the act itself was more expressive than any words." The *Apostolic Constitutions* prescribe the order in which the various grades of people should receive: after the bishop, the presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, and the other grades of the clergy; the ascetics in a group by themselves; among the women, the deaconesses, virgins, and widows; lastly, "all the people in order."‡

St. Clement of Rome speaks of the orderliness of the liturgy, in which the high priest, the priests, the levites, and the laity all have their appointed places;§ and the fact that his language is Jewish does not refute the impression which the passage gives, that he has the Christian Eucharist in mind. It is not necessary to quote the familiar language of St. Ignatius, in which he speaks of the bishop as surrounded by the presbyters and deacons; but it is important to note that these allusions come again and

* *Ibid.*, col. 2471.

† Heb. viii. 3.

‡ Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic* (S.P.C.K., 1930), p. 32. The same writer shows (p. 43 and elsewhere) how the fellowship of communion contributes an important element to the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice, esp. in Augustine. Cf. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 203-209.

§ *Ep. Clem. ad Corinthios*, ch. 40.

again in a liturgical connection in such a way as to show clearly that the writer's mental picture is that of the Church's worship.* So in St. Cyprian: *quando in unum convenimus et sacrificia divina cum Dei sacerdote (sc. episcopo) celebramus*† . . . the celebration of the sacrifice is the corporate act of the Church.

With a little imagination we may picture the solemn mass in a Roman basilica during the early period.‡ Behind the altar, in the apse, are the bishop's throne and the seats of the presbyters; thus when the bishop stands at the altar, he is on the far side of it—the only possible position in the old basilicas§—and thus takes the same position which the Lord must have occupied at the Last Supper. Round him are grouped his priests; the seven deacons, seven subdeacons, and the acolytes are in their appointed places. There is assuredly some historical connection between this picture and that of the heavenly worship in Rev. iv. v.:|| “Behold a throne set in heaven . . . and round about the throne four and twenty seats, and upon the seats four and twenty presbyters sitting, clothed in white robes”; and the seven lamps of fire, and the singing of the *Sanctus*, and in the midst a Lamb standing, as it had been slain.¶

THE RITE OF CONCELEBRATION

What, then, was the actual part taken by the presbyters? The *Ordo Romanus Primus* (circa 8th century) describes how they said the canon with the bishop; and this fact gives the explanation of a whole series of allusions in earlier sources. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*, Pope Zephyrinus, about A.D. 200, introduced glass patens to be held by the ministers before the priests while the bishop celebrated the mass: Duchesne interprets this of concelebration, and Fortescue says that “the rite of concelebration was modified at Rome (perhaps in the time of Pope Zephyrinus, 202-218) so that each priest consecrated a separate host . . . but they all consecrated the same chalice.”** Again, concelebration seems to be reflected in the words of the canon: “*Unde et memores nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta . . . offerimus*”; *nos* is the bishop and the concelebrant priests.

We may infer from Pope Innocent's letter to Decentius of

* Ephes. 4, Magn. 6, 7, Smyrn. 8, etc.

† *De oratione dominica*, ch. 7.

‡ For descriptions of the ancient Roman service, see Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, pp. 58 ff., 179 ff.; Frere, *Principles of Religious Ceremonial* (1928 edition), p. 62 ff.

§ Frere, p. 63.

|| Atchley, p. 12; Frere, p. 40.

¶ Rev. iv. 3, 4, 5, 8; v. 6. Cf. also vi. 9.

** Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, i., 139; Fortescue in *Cath. Encyc.*, loc. cit.

Eugubium* (A.D. 416) that concelebration was practised at the stational masses except on Sundays: "Concerning the *fermentum*, which we send on Sundays to the titular churches, it was superfluous for you to consult us, since all our churches are within the city. Since their presbyters, on account of the congregations entrusted to them, cannot join with us (*nobiscum convenire non possunt*) on that day, therefore they receive by the hands of acolytes the *fermentum* consecrated by us, in order that, on that day above all, they may not regard themselves as separated from communion with us. But I do not think that this should be done for the country parishes, because the sacraments ought not to be carried a long distance, and those priests have the right and licence to consecrate them."

On this passage Dom Beauduin comments thus: As Christianity extended, it became difficult to apply the strict rule that priests should concelebrate with their bishop. In a little provincial town like Eugubium there would be no difficulty. In the capital, Roman sagacity found a way to provide for the many congregations within the city, while still maintaining the principle of the unity of the sacrifice. Bishop Decentius proposes to follow suit, by sending the *fermentum* to the country parishes round Eugubium, but Innocent dissuades him: *non longe portanda sunt sacramenta*, and his own cemetery-presbyters, outside the walls, have the right to celebrate independently. From this Dom de Puniet infers that the city-presbyters had at this time no such right; they had only licence to concelebrate with the bishop. Thus the fact that in another letter Innocent says that his priests celebrate daily, means that they concelebrate at the stational mass, except on Sundays.† Finally, says Dom Beauduin, the meaning of "to join with us" (*nobiscum convenire*) is fixed by the use of the same word at the beginning of the letter to Decentius: Decentius knows the Roman rite because he has visited Rome and has "joined with us in the church." It was a regular mark of hospitality to visiting bishops to offer them a place among the concelebrants; so Gregory the Great received the delegates from Constantinople, and *missarum sollemnia mecum celebrare feci*.‡ The same may, perhaps, be the true explanation of the act of Anicetus, who allowed Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist in the church;§ though, on the other hand, both Rufinus and the Council of Arles appear to quote the phrase as if they believed that Anicetus yielded place to his visitor.||

The rite of concelebration is thus described in the *First*

* *Ep.* xxv., ch. 5. Migne, P.L., vol xx., col. 556-557.

† *Ep.* ii., ch. 9; Migne, P.L. xx., col. 476.

‡ *Ep.* viii., ch. 34. P.L. lxxvii., col. 892.

§ Eusebius, *H.E.*, v., 24, quoting Irenæus. || Canon 19 of Arles (A.D. 314).

Roman Ordo: "At festivals, that is, Easter, Pentecost, St. Peter, and Christmas, the cardinal presbyters assemble, each holding a corporal in his hand, and the archdeacon comes and offers each of them three breads. And when the pontiff goes to the altar, they surround the altar to right and left, and say the canon together with him (holding the breads in their hands, not over the altar) so that the voice of the pontiff is more clearly heard; and together they consecrate the body and blood of the Lord, but only the pontiff makes the sign of the cross over the altar to right and left."*

Dom Beauduin comments thus: Concelebration is still practised at Rome, but only on great festivals; and strangely enough, those very cardinal-priests who had been the first to be dispensed from the rule of concelebration, are the last to practise it. Their ever-growing importance had by now put at their disposal numerous inferior clergy who could take their place in the titular churches. Thus on great festivals the Pope is surrounded by the members of the Sacred College and concelebrates with them. All recite the canon, but the pontiff's voice dominates—the parenthesis which we have inserted above is manifestly required by the sense—and he alone makes the sign of the cross to right and left; these last words indicate the position of the concelebrants and the breads which they hold. This is the origin of the multiple signings with the cross in the Roman canon.

This description is further attested by Amalarius of Metz, who visited Rome about 831, and describes what he saw:† "It is the custom of the Roman church that in the celebration of the immolation of Christ (*i.e.*, as usually interpreted, the Maundy Thursday mass) presbyters are present, and consecrate together with the pontiff by word and manual act."

Concelebration was still practised at Rome in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries at the solemn mass on certain festivals. *Ordo Romanus XI.* mentions the presence of seven cardinals, three on one side of the Pope and four on the other, concelebrating with him at Christmas.‡ Innocent III. († 1216) devotes a chapter of his treatise *De sacro altaris mysterio* to concelebration, speaks of it as a custom of the Roman Church, and establishes its legitimacy.

* Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, p. 148. The St. Amand MS. (p. 158) specifies further Epiphany, Holy Saturday, Easter Monday, and Ascension Day; speaks of two breads instead of three; and says that the pontiff's recitation of the canon is just audible to the presbyters.

† *De Ecclesiasticis officiis*, i., ch. xii.: P.L. cv., col. 1016. It is possible, however, that he is not referring to Maundy Thursday at all, and that he believed that concelebration was the regular usage at Rome.

‡ Ch. 20. *Ordo Romanus XI.* is by Canon Benedict, ceremoniaris to the papal court († 1140).

These are the last testimonies to concelebration as a regular usage at Rome, apart from the ordination masses in which it still survives. St. Thomas Aquinas accepts and justifies the principle of the rite, but makes no allusion to its use except at the ordination mass.* But before we proceed to consider the causes of its disuse, we must inquire how widespread was its use in the early centuries.

Our evidence so far has been mainly Roman, indeed papal; and it might be a tempting inference on general grounds that concelebration was the universal custom of the early Church. So Dom Martène († 1739), the great Benedictine liturgiologist, wrote: "This rite, which is still maintained among the Greeks, but among the Latins has survived only at the ordination of bishops and priests, if it were revived now, would doubtless seem to most people very strange; yet it is shown by many testimonies to have been the common practice both in the Eastern and in the Western Church for some thirteen hundred years."†

The actual evidence, however, says Dom de Puniet, does not bear out this statement. For the East, he can indeed quote Canon 14 of the Council of Neocæsarea in 315, about *χωρεπίσκοποι* invited to offer the holy sacrifice with the bishop, and called *συλλειτουργοί*; and he refers to certain statements of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon which point in the same direction. There is further evidence in the ancient canons of concelebrants holding their hands over the oblation during the eucharistic prayer, but not apparently joining in the recitation of the prayer. But he finds also definite evidence of cases where concelebration is excluded. In *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* (fifth century) we are clearly shown one bishop or priest chosen from those present, and officiating alone, while the others keep silence:‡ further, the liturgies provide for a single celebrant, assisted by a deacon, and the commentaries, which treat of the ritual of pontifical mass, all take for granted that the eucharistic prayer is said by a single celebrant.

Of course, concelebration in the wider sense has always been a distinctive feature of the Eastern mass, and the commentaries to which we have just referred often dwell on the mystical meaning of the grouping of the clergy round the bishop. But concelebration in the strict sense does not appear to have been at any rate a regular usage in the early Church in the East. In later times concelebration (in the strict sense) has become much more common in the Eastern Church, both Orthodox and

* *Summa Theologica*, Part III., lxxxii. 2.

† *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, Bk. I., ch. iii., art. 8.

‡ Ed. Dom R. H. Connolly (Cambridge, 1909), pp. 4, 11-12, 27.

Uniate, on ordinary days as well as on festivals; we have already seen that it is attested both by Pope Benedict and by Dom Martène in the eighteenth century, and Cardinal Bona in the seventeenth century bears similar testimony.* In many parts of the Eastern Church it appears to be in use today as a regular custom.†

As regards the West, whether it belonged or not to the original Gallican rite, it would be certain to spread outwards from Rome. We hear of it at Nola in the time of St. Paulinus.‡ In France, the fact that it once existed is proved by certain interesting survivals of ancient custom. As late as the early eighteenth century pontifical mass seems to have been still celebrated at Lyons by the bishop, with the assistance of six priests, called *symmistæ* or *symmuses* (a title vulgarly corrupted to *les six muses*), seven deacons, seven subdeacons, and seven taperers; Roman influence is evident. Similar evidence is given for Vienne in Dauphiné, Angers, Sens, Orleans, Chartres. They were still (at Orleans) joining in the canon, but the bishop alone said the words of consecration.§

CAUSES AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DISUSE OF CONCELEBRATION

"The rite of concelebration," says Dom Beauduin, "which we have traced down to the thirteenth century, did not escape the general decadence of liturgical traditions, which continued and increased during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and was bitterly deplored by several contemporary writers, among them the learned Radulphus of Tongres." He then suggests a variety of causes for its disappearance. The prolonged sojourn of the Popes at Avignon (1305-1378) led necessarily to a deterioration of the papal liturgical tradition, which, cut off from its roots in the city of Rome, withered in the foreign climate. The ever-growing prominence of private masses insensibly accustomed both clergy and people to a more expeditious and convenient form of service—a tendency which was noted and resisted by several Councils in the fourteenth century, in particular that of Trèves, 1310. He then discusses two particular causes,

* *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo*, in which the whole subject of concelebration is discussed. Cardinal Bona died in 1674.

† These two paragraphs, and the following paragraph, are summarized from Dom de Puniet, cols. 2478 f., 2475 f. I have not been able to find any independent evidence for the modern Eastern practice. It seems to follow that in the ancient Eastern Church priests regularly made their communion at the service, much as in the traditional Anglican practice.

‡ *De obitu Sancti Paulini*, P.L. lxxvii., col. 892.

§ *Voyages liturgiques en France*, par le Sieur de Moleon (Paris 1718), pp. 47, 72-73, 197, etc.

the influence of the mendicant Orders, especially the Franciscans, and the subtleties of decadent scholasticism. We shall suggest yet another cause: the fact that this is the very period at which the communion of the people finally disappeared from the Sunday High Mass.

First, then, Cardinal Bona († 1674) thus explains the disuse of concelebration: "The reason why it passed out of use seems to me to be primarily that when the mendicant Orders were founded and spread far and wide, the demand for masses increased greatly (*multiplicata sunt onera missarum*), and thus it became necessary for priests to celebrate daily in order to meet the demand."* But there are other points to be noted. The Franciscans, those indefatigable missionaries, needed to have both the Liturgy and the Divine Office in a conveniently portable and therefore more compendious form; and this form tended to spread wherever they went. Now first arose the *Breviarium*—the name is very significant—and the single *Missal*, which combined in one book the parts which had previously been shared among many people and distributed among a variety of books. This involved a simplification and an individualization of the liturgy itself.

Then, too, the zeal of the mendicant Orders, contrasting favourably with the sluggishness of the official clergy and the older Orders, tended to attract the faithful from their parish churches to the new churches belonging to the Friars, and ended by abolishing altogether the ancient obligation of all Christians to be present at the solemn celebration of the mysteries in their own parish church. We can trace the stages. Councils at Arles (1260), Avignon (1282), Trèves (1310), Ravenna (1311), all threaten with severe penalties any Religious who hold public preachings at the time when solemn mass is celebrated in the parish church, or even admit the public to their own services on Sundays and festivals. Evidently the church authorities are struggling to uphold the ancient unity of worship, the old *Synaxis* of the Christian family in the church every Sunday. But two centuries later the issue is as good as decided. Now the Religious are being forbidden to preach publicly that the laity need not hear mass in their own churches on Sundays and feasts, as in the Constitution *Vices illius* of Sixtus IV. (June 17, 1478). But in the Constitution *Intelleximus* of Leo X. (November 13, 1517), it is formally ruled that the faithful who hear mass in the churches of the mendicant Orders are thereby satisfying the precept of the Church.

There was thus in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a strong current tending towards the decentralization of worship,

* *Op. cit.*, bk. I, ch. xviii., 9.

at the cost of the solemn public liturgy; and if the ancient obligation to attend the *Synaxis* of the faithful was not able to resist the tendency of the time, can we wonder that the last traces of the rite of concelebration should disappear at the same period?

But Dom Beauduin thinks that a still more important cause is to be found in the sterile discussions of scholasticism in its decadence, when a parasitic vegetation stifled the strong tree of genuine theological science. The rite of concelebration provided an ideal subject for such argumentation. Thus such questions were asked as the following, which is mentioned by Innocent III. in the treatise referred to above:* Whether, if one of the concelebrants were to utter the words of consecration a little in advance of the principal celebrant, he would not in fact effect the consecration? What, then, would the other celebrants be doing? And would not the intention of the principal celebrant go for nought? Another type of question, more important in its practical bearings, was this: Can each of the concelebrants form his own intention and receive a *stipendium*? The common answer was in the negative; and it was only later, when the question had lost its actuality, that de Lugo's opinion prevailed, that if two priests together consecrated one host, there were two oblations, and so each could apply the mass to a different object.

These extravagances were indeed the less excusable, since St. Thomas Aquinas had already propounded the true solution, in his discussion of concelebration in *Summa Theologica*, Pt. III., Q. 82, art. 2:† "If any one of the priests were functioning by virtue of some power of his own, then other celebrants would be superfluous, since one is sufficient to celebrate. But because the priest only consecrates in the person of Christ, and the many are one in Christ, therefore it matters not whether the sacrament be consecrated by one or by many, only that it is necessary that the rite ordered by the church be observed." Thus our priesthood has its essential principle of unity in the priesthood of Christ, and the question whether there should be several celebrants or one is for church authority to determine. It may be noted, however, that just as Christ is the invisible centre of the unity of priesthood, its visible centre in each place is the bishop; and that it was just this point that the ancient rite of concelebration was intended to emphasize.

But this illuminating answer of St. Thomas seems to have been lost to sight by the later scholastics. In such an atmosphere concelebration had no chance; and, perhaps, also the fact that it was practised in the East served to prejudice against it the minds of many in the West.

* *De sacro altaris mysterio*, bk. iv., ch. 25. P.L. ccxvii., col. 873 f.

† Père de la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei* (Paris, 1921), pp. 354-6.

Would it not, however, be more just to say that this last reason which Dom Beauduin gives was rather an effect than a cause? Surely the reason why the later scholastics wished to pull Concelebration to pieces was that the idea which it represented had become to them an alien idea; and the main reason for this was, that the communion of the people had now disappeared from the Sunday High Mass. This fact, which Dr. Brilioth is justified in calling "the great disaster" in the history of the liturgy,* has scarcely yet received the thorough investigation which it deserves. It is certain, on the one hand, that in the time of Gregory the Great, and that of the *First Roman Ordo*, there were still large numbers of communicants at the chief service; and on the other, that as early as Chrysostom we hear complaints of slackness with regard to communion; that in the Carolingian period a minimum of three communions a year was enjoined, which at the Lateran Council of 1215 was reduced to one: and that in the later Middle Ages the communion of the people at the chief service had ceased altogether. Its actual disappearance seems to be fixed by the shrinkage of the communion chants to the fragment which survives in the Roman mass of today, between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries.†

The evidence is, however, sufficient to justify the generalization that in the Western Church concelebration and the communion of the people at the chief service coincide fairly closely in the periods of their vigour, their decline, and their disappearance. Indeed, both usages expressed different sides of one and the same idea; and as the number of lay communicants at the great service gradually dwindled year after year, and finally shrank to vanishing-point, and consequently the sole centre of the rite came to be more and more the act of consecration, the corporate communion of the concelebrant priests would be felt to be more and more of an anomaly. It is therefore no accident that just at this period the Elevation of the Host begins to make its appearance, and also that Thomas à Kempis, two centuries later, is found to be treating of communion solely from an individualistic point of view. "Thomas à Kempis represents, perhaps, the sacramental piety of the Middle Ages at its very best; but it is to be noted that while he gives us many beautiful sayings about the union of the individual Christian with the Lord, we find in him scarcely a trace of the thought which was so central to the view of the primitive Church, the union of the faithful with one another through communion."‡

Concelebration, whether in the narrower or in the wider

* *Op. cit.*, p. 279; cf. 80 f., 224.

† Brilioth p. 33; *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chr. et de liturgie*, s.v. communion, col. 2436.

‡ Brilioth, p. 81; cf. p. 89 f.

sense, and the fellowship of communion, are in fact two parallel expressions of one idea, and the loss of the one cannot be unconnected with the loss of the other. Both were lost when the idea which they expressed had ceased, for the time being, to be part of the living consciousness of the Church.

CONCLUSION

The facts that we have quoted, from both Eastern and Western practice, show clearly that the rite of Concelebration is in no sense a liturgical freak or oddity, but rather belongs to the main line of the Church's eucharistic tradition, while the idea which it expresses is in the fullest sense Catholic. But in the Latin Church of the mediæval and modern period, whatever other elements of positive value may have been developed in the Church's sacramental life, *this* aspect of the Eucharist has for the most part been in abeyance; to this extent the richness of the Catholic inheritance has been diminished, and the glorious promise of the early Church has remained unfulfilled.

With regard to ourselves, it will scarcely be disputed that the Church of England at the Reformation desired to feel its way back to the primitive and Catholic idea of the unity of worship, which we have been studying. We cannot here even attempt to estimate the extent to which that ideal achieved any sort of fulfilment in the Church of England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; certainly it is only in a few places and on a small scale that it finds any true expression today. It can scarcely be said to be even approached either in the usual type of "early celebration" or in the non-communicating High Mass, which resembles the mediæval type of service.

The subject of this article has for the writer an interest that is very much more than merely archæological. But it has not been written in order to plead for the revival of the rite of Concelebration; the actual rite itself is of less importance than the idea which underlies it. That idea is in the fullest and truest sense Catholic; it is, that the common offering of the great central act of Christian worship by the Church in each place, grouped round its Chief Pastor, culminates in the united pleading of the sacrifice and in the fellowship of communion. It will be one of the chief blessings of that reunion with the Eastern Churches, to which we may now look forward with thankful anticipation, that we shall be able to look to them for help in the recovery of the ancient and Catholic idea of Christian worship, which they have maintained more faithfully than any other part of Christendom.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE CENTRALITY OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST*

I AM not going to attempt to say anything new on the sacred subject that unites us in this Confraternity. On the contrary, I want to take what we already know and consider how it may be so arranged in our minds as best to help those who do not share our vision and devotion.

We do not want to pose as forming a little catholic aristocracy, but we have been given, by the grace of God, a vision and devotion which have made all the difference in the world to our understanding of religion and through it to our whole life. Many of us owe this enlightenment to talks with others, and we in turn are constantly being brought into contact with people who are quite pathetically longing to share the vision. We never know when a talk with a friend or a chance acquaintance may lead up to the subject. It is desperate to be unprepared, and rather unreal to recommend a book, even if we can think of one on the spur of the moment which is likely to appeal successfully to the person we are talking to. It is not to be expected that we shall have the theology of the subject at our finger-ends, but I think it is natural that we should be able to say: "Well, now, I'll tell you how it seems to me." And what I want to do in this paper is to suggest in a quite simple way "How it seems to me."

A PARABLE

In the first place, "it seems to me" that when our talk does lead up to the subject of religion, and when it is evident that the other person does really want an inkling of what we hold, it is just the sort of case where our Lord would have employed a parable. Why not ask him if he has ever thought of the difference between a sampler and a picture? Everyone knows what a sampler is. Most of us have one in our homes, possibly an heirloom from a century or more ago. We all admire it as a painstaking production, but we never regard it as a picture. The various objects in it do not "group." The eye wanders to and fro amongst the letters of the alphabet, the numerals, the quaint trees, birds and beasts, and cannot rest anywhere. Why? Because the objects are unrelated to any centre and consequently unrelated to each other.

* An address to the associates of the C.B.S. at the Annual Festival of the Ward of the Incarnation, Torquay, on the Feast of St. John, *ante port. Lat.*, 1930.

THE RELIGION OF THE SAMPLER

The sampler is like the religion of so many. It was the religion of most of us at one time. And, mind you, it *was* religion—of sorts. We said our prayers. We went to church. We read our Bible. We did little odds and ends of good. All highly creditable, very painstaking. In fact, there were more pains in it than pleasures—a formal, joyless, stilted sort of affair. Why? Because it had no centre. Its duties were disconnected, its beliefs unrelated, its emotions unregulated. It was all over the place, therefore “nowhere at all.”

THE PICTURE

Contrast with it the picture. In a picture, however simple or complex it may be, there is always a central object which gives relation and proportion and tone to everything else in it. There is no question which is the higher form of art. And there can be no question that religion, if it is to interest us—to put it no higher than that, at present—must have in it the element of creative art, must be related to something which is central to the whole, which, indeed, makes a “whole” of whatever there is.

There will be no difficulty in getting agreement as to this. Well, then, we go on to ask: What is the centre of our religion? Most people, the people we are thinking of, will answer, perhaps, after a little hesitation: “I suppose, Christ.” Quite right. The Christian life must obviously centre in Christ. But

IN WHAT SENSE IS CHRIST THE CENTRE?

That is the question that brings us down to bed-rock. It is so easy to say Christ is the centre, without exactly knowing what we mean. In what sense is He the centre? One will reply: “I suppose, in the sense of our believing in Him.” But surely Christianity is more than a belief! Belief, we hasten to admit, is indispensable. But belief does not necessarily establish Christ as the centre of our life. The reply is supplemented: “In the sense of His being our example.” But then to take such a Life as Christ’s as our example without power to copy it would prove the most hopeless kind of religion! Again the reply is qualified: “Of course, in the sense of our trust in His power to help us.” But is not that perilously like centring religion in our own trust, and laying it open to the “auto-suggestion” by which some try to explain away all that is deepest in Christian experience? The trust is essential. We don’t want to minimize it. But there is such a thing as false emphasis, and it is a very dangerous thing. It is usually people of an “evangelical”

tradition who furnish this last reply, and it is necessary firmly to insist on the fact that to trust in our trust is as unevangelical as to trust in our works. The one is as self-centred as the other. We must bring one and all back to the original admission: Christ is the centre, not ourselves, not our belief, nor our endeavour, nor our trust, but Christ. And, once more, in what sense?

CHRIST'S OWN ANSWER

Has He Himself established no centre, by which He comes, in which He remains, through which He strengthens and saves? Is there no sensible, visible medium by which Christ takes His central place in our lives, by which He empowers us to follow His example, by the proved effects of which our faith in His Sovereignty grows and our love and desire are quickened and increased? Is there no channel of His communicated Life? Is there nothing that *presents* Christ, that calls out all our powers in worship, that gives us to share in His Sacrifice, that unites us one with another in the fellowship of one Body?

The answer lives in the sacred words He used at Capernaum and in the Upper Room: "Whoso eateth Me, the same shall live by Me." "This is My Body." There can be no doubt that those words were spoken in anticipation of, and at the institution of, the Holy Eucharist. Here, then, is the centre of the spiritual life of each and of the religion of all.

THE TRUE CENTRE, ACCORDING TO CHRIST HIMSELF

The Eucharist is His institution. It rests on His authority. It is His chosen means of abiding with His own, of giving us to assist in His Sacrifice and pleading His merits, of communicating His Life to us.

All our devotions merge in it, for either they prepare us for it, or else express in our actions the blessedness of its effects. All the other Sacraments converge upon it: Baptism, including Confirmation, as the commencement of our membership with Christ, our preparation by the Holy Spirit for His communicated Life and the responsibilities that Life brings with it. Penance, the cleansing of the soul for receiving Him afresh; Orders, for these obviously centre in it, being essentially sacerdotal, for where there is no Sacrifice, there could be no priests. It has also the deepest social significance. The nuptial Mass brings the Eucharist into direct relationship with the basis of society, and indirectly with the whole Christian social order modelled on the family as the family of God. And in the Viaticum the Eucharist presents Christ the Conqueror of death, the Resurrection and the Life.

ALL RELIGIOUS EXERCISES CENTRE IN THE EUCHARIST

Here, then, is something that "pulls our religion together," as a skilled artist will take an amateur's picture and by defining the centre will bring the whole into focus and interest. The Eucharist is the centre of all our prayer—which is itself the most fundamental of all our religious exercises. Now the inquirer will begin to see how the daily Eucharist with its infinite variety of intention is organically one with our dependence on God, and in the various aspects of the Holy Sacrifice, in votive Masses, in Requiems, it is the Sacrifice of the present Christ which is all-availing. And he will go on to see from this how the daily offices, the Hours, the ceremonial and ritual and sacramentals of the Church, our duty, the daily offering of ourselves in our tasks, "the utmost for the highest," our love for one another and our concern for the conversion of the world—how all these are parts one of another, because they all centre in the Sacrifice and the communicated Life.

THE EUCHARIST THE CENTRE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

And when the inquirer has got this vision of the centrality of the Eucharist to religion as a devotion and a life, it will not be long before he recognises that the Eucharist is also central to our religious knowledge. I must confess that a good many books on the subject seem to me to deal in "sampler" theology! They generally set out from the Divine attributes, and go on to a kind of reasoned Trinity and proceed through a number of miscellaneous doctrines, till at last one finds the Eucharist packed away together with Baptism in a sort of appendix on "Christian institutions"! Surely the most cogent evidence of the Person of Christ, upon whom our entire religious knowledge depends, is contained in the Eucharist. Theology must start there, and then work backwards through what He said the Eucharist is, and the circumstances in which He said it—His ministry of redemption and reconciliation—and thence to the beginning of all His work in the Incarnation; and then to all the Incarnation discloses as to the nature of God and the redeeming purpose and the opposition of sin; and finally to the creative Love whence all creature life began.

What I mean is that religious knowledge is not likely to interest us until we perceive God in our own experience. We want to know God not in metaphysics but in Christ. What our hearts long for, in all our sin and waywardness, is the God-Man who forgave and healed and restored. And it is in the Eucharist we find Him. Then, having found and worshipped and received

Him, *then* indeed theology becomes of paramount interest, and all that He revealed, and all the Church by the guidance of the Holy Spirit has developed of that revelation, falls into due and admirable proportion.

THE EUCHARIST THE GUARDIAN OF THE TRUTH

And there is another reason for this eucharistic centrality of doctrine; so long as we worship Christ present in the Eucharist it is next to impossible for us to go wrong in our belief. The Mass is an epitome of the knowledge of Divine things. All that is necessary for us to believe and to hold is preserved beyond doubt or disorder in the mind of one whose devotion centres in the Eucharist. "He that doeth the Will shall know of the doctrine"—the Will, *i.e.*, "Do this in remembrance of Me."

Once more,

THE EUCHARIST IS CENTRAL TO THE CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH

The existence of the one implies the other. Obedience to Christ implies both. Those who tell us that they can follow Christ independently of the Church should be asked what they make of the words: "This do in remembrance of Me." How can they "do this" apart from the Church by whom it has always been done? But we generally find that the difficulties of such people arise from a wrong idea of the Church. They regard the Church as a collection of people who profess to be better, and very much better, than their neighbours; and when it turns out that we are not better, and sometimes even worse, than others, we are set down as a particularly odious class of hypocrites whom it will be well to have nothing to do with.

A FALSE IDEA OF THE CHURCH AT THE BACK OF MODERN CRITICISM

Now it is certainly true that the Church has a moral ideal which men ordinarily do not profess and a standard of holiness which its members are expected to come up to—a standard which is certainly not to be found elsewhere; but—and here is where our critics make the mistake—the Church is not the Church *because of* this ideal; the Church is a body of men and

* It is sometimes urged, quite reverently and sincerely, that Christ's words were spoken in order to hallow the common life by hallowing a common meal. Those who do so forget that the words were not uttered at a common meal, but apart from a common meal, and have not learned that the whole phrase, in its context, is sacrificial, in the sense preserved by St. Paul: "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death, till He come" (1 Cor xi. 26).

women nourished by the communicated Life of their Lord. This is the eucharistic idea of the Church, and it is the only one that has any foundation in fact.

It abounds in imperfections and inconsistencies simply because those who form it are at best convalescents, persons under treatment, patients of the Great Physician in whom grace is working a difficult and slow but, we believe, certain cure. It would be as reasonable to withdraw our subscription from a hospital because it is not full of cured people as it is to hold aloof from the Church because of its imperfections. In that respect the Church is more like a hospital than any other human institution with which we could compare it.

We need to insist—as occasion arises—on this eucharistic conception of the Church. It will not exempt us from criticism—God forbid that it should—but it will save our adversaries from the sin and folly of *unjust* criticism, and cannot but aid the work of grace in their hearts. The world has got to understand that it starts with a wholly wrong idea of the Church, an idea which is unjustifiable on any sort of ground, historical, philosophical or religious. The Church is an organism created by the communicated Life of Jesus Christ, precariously dependent on the continued goodwill of those who constitute it. It is a kind of intensive evolution with a constant tendency to revert to type. The only guarantee of its continuance is the Eucharist. “Apart from Me ye can do nothing.”

WHERE IS THE TRUE CHURCH?

But if this is so, it also follows that the Eucharist alone constitutes the true Church. When we say “alone,” we are not, of course, overlooking the initiatory Sacrament of Baptism, nor the Succession from the Apostles (Holy Order), both of which, together with penance, the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin, are essential to the Eucharist, inasmuch as the Eucharist cannot be savingly received by those who are out of grace, nor consecrated except by those who derive their commission from the Apostles. When we speak of the Eucharist we must take care that all this is understood, and we can never safely assume that it is understood, so uninstructed in the elements of the Catholic religion are the majority with whom we come into contact. But, granted that it is understood, then when we are asked where the Church is, or where is the true Church? our reply is that the Church is where the Eucharist is, for the simple and self-evident reason that a thing is living because of the life within it.

Two things, as every biologist will tell us, are essential to an organism: (1) The *life*, by which it lives and moves and has its

being; (2) *structure*, by which that life is contained and maintained and handed on. Both life and structure are essential, and it is difficult to separate them or to assign priority to either. Yet in the order of thought, at least, we place life first, since without life the organism would be structure merely, a first-rate machine, but nothing more. It is the Presence of Christ Himself—and now you see the importance of our watchword, the “Real Presence”—that differentiates the Church from the finest organization conceivable, and renders it an *organism*.

Of course, there must be structure: the apostolic framework, the apostolic authority, continuously and faithfully administered in accord with the deposit of faith and the institutional development of the Church. And this structure must be the Church's own, nor can its place be taken for a moment by any social or political or national machinery. Yet for all its structure, hierarchical and other, the Church would be derelict to-morrow, and would cease to be the Church but for the communicated Life of her Lord. And as the Holy Eucharist is the channel of this communicated Life, the Eucharist is, and must ever remain, central to the very existence of the Church.

THE EUCHARIST INDICATES OUR ATTITUDE TO QUESTIONS OF UNION WITH OTHER CHRISTIAN BODIES

These reflections will, I hope, aid us in our intercourse not only with the uninstructed, but with members of Christian groups about us, particularly in deciding our attitude towards those questions of union which are so persistently before us at this time. We are not called upon to pronounce negative judgment on those who set up a criterion of Christian fellowship other than that of the catholic and apostolic Church. But we are bound to be loyal to the trust that has been committed to us. We have been shown by the grace of God the Way, and we are concerned with pointing the Way, and not with those who do not take it. When members of other groups tell us of their numbers, of the results of their work, of their belief in Christ, we are not required to dispute these things or to prove them to be in the wrong. All this we leave to Him who alone is Judge. But when they propose union with us, we are bound in sincerity to ask them whether they are “of one mind” with us on sacramental grace; the transmitted grace of Holy Order; the Real Presence; the eucharistic nature of the Church. Upon their attitude to these must turn the possibility of union, since union in the Body of Christ is not and cannot be a man-made amalgamation, but an organic union effected by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those who acknowledge the recorded Will of Christ to be supreme.

We long with all our heart for union with everyone who acknowledges the Lordship of Jesus Christ. It is no small part of the cross we have to bear to seem to many to be hard and unrelenting and "bigoted." But we cannot close our ears to the test-saying of the Lord Himself: "Why call ye me Lord, and do not the things that I say?"

OUR LOYALTY IS TO THE EUCHARIST ITSELF, NOT TO ANY
STATEMENT ABOUT IT

Finally, I want to guard against giving the impression that in treating the Holy Eucharist as I have as the centre of our spiritual life and fellowship, I should seem to be putting before you an idea, or *merely* a doctrine, or anything that can become lip-service only, as the centre. So let me say with all the earnestness I am capable of that it is not what we *think about* the Eucharist that centralizes our religion in Christ; it is the Real Presence of Jesus Christ Himself worshipped and pleaded and received in the Eucharist. Our belief about the Blessed Sacrament might be such as would satisfy the great Saint Thomas himself, but that would not make us Catholics. It is the Eucharist itself, that is to say, it is Christ Himself, that is the centre of all. We all need to pray much for that simplicity, that humble dependence on Him, that communion with Him which can alone keep us loyal, and while loyal charitable, and while charitable full of loving zeal to lose no opportunity of directing the souls about us to Him in His own appointed Way.

T. J. HARDY.

PERSONALITY AND HOLY COMMUNION*

I ASSUME at the outset three points to which I believe all here will assent:

(1) The supreme importance of personality. This seems one of the discoveries, shall I say revelations (though the two are one), of this age. It is an accepted principle of modern thought and modern philosophy—of which we as evolutionists are heirs—that there is a graduated scale of Reality and of Being. We may summarize it thus. There are degrees of Reality; life is higher than matter; personality is higher than mere vitality; God is highest of all.

We are, or ought all to be, in search of Reality. The only

* A paper read recently to the West Surrey Clerical Association, under the title of *The Impact of the Personality of Christ in Holy Communion*.

Reality we know in life is our own personality, the self, which says "Thou art thou," and "I am I." God would seem to have implanted in each human heart a germ which is meant to develop, and form the personality of that man. The way in which we treat that germ determines what we become.

In speaking of such profundities—and personality is an abysmal mystery—we are like children, groping in the dark; but seeing that the origin of this instinct is God, it may be permissible to regard this germ as God's idea of what each of us should be. If so, we may call it the Christ in any man, a hidden Christ, the Christ that is meant to be. Then we may regard the world as a field in which this germ, or idea of God, this potential Christ, or personality, may be developed and produced.

Anyhow we shall all agree that the highest thing we know in life—next to God, whom we only know in part—is human personality. That God is also personal we believe; certainly Jesus taught that He is, and if He were not, we could hold no intercourse with Him.

(2) That when we are speaking of personality, the personality of Jesus is the highest, fullest, completest the world has ever known. He touches Reality at every point, being one with God, who is ultimate Reality. He is the image of God; God's Reality is mirrored in Him. Even from the merely philosophical standpoint—a lower one than the religious—Jesus fulfils in Himself all the generally accepted triad of Realities. He is "Goodness" incarnate. He is "Beauty," and "altogether lovely." He is "Truth" "*the Truth*." All this triple star is fully and adequately seen in and worn by Him. As St. Paul in the Colossians tells us, He is the concentrated Reality of the Universe.

(3) This personality of Jesus never could or can be self-contained or self-regarding; it is always universal (in various senses of the word) and dynamic. It deliberately exists to propagate, to reproduce, to perpetuate itself. It aims at moulding and fashioning the personality of all God's children, all the younger brethren of the family. Clearly that was the intention of His Incarnation, of His sharing human life with us; that by imparting His personality—which He shares with God—we might share it too, and so become like God. Those three points, as I said, you will all assent to.

Now if personality is one of the great discoveries of the age, the Church is thereby called upon to restate her teaching in the light of personality. A living Church ought to be constantly doing tasks of this sort, bringing its teaching up to date as new knowledge arrives. It can never be content to remain static. God has many revelatory mediums—science, history, discovery,

thought, invention. The Church needs constantly to be an *Ecclesia discens* as well as an *Ecclesia docens*.

More often than not, "restatement" of a truth will prove to be "reinstatement" of what was there long before, but lacked recognition and expression. Of course, no one can put new truths into Holy Communion. Anything true about it must have been there all along—put there by Jesus. But it is possible to draw out truths from Holy Communion which are fresh to us or to our age.

This inherent power of bringing a new message to every age, and of revealing new facets of truth, is one of the marvellous characteristics of the memorial which Jesus selected for Himself, and markedly differentiates it from our human ones.

My suggestion is that Holy Communion finds its most complete fulfilment in carrying out the work of Jesus, which we have been contemplating—i.e., in mediating His personality to men, and in changing them into His likeness. If He be the highest personality and we be lower ones, then Holy Communion is His medium, His *vade mecum*.

I have not seen any attempt to do this work of restatement for Holy Communion, and I think it needs doing. If we can infuse the whole rite with the atmosphere of personality we shall not sacrifice any of the other aspects we have been accustomed to, but enhance them all. The lure of personality is great.

Our sources for doing this are ample. There are the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper and of the eucharistic meals which preceded it, such as the feeding of the 5,000 and of the 4,000 (if they are indeed separate events), and there are all the details in the Fourth Gospel of the evening in the Upper Room. There are the various liturgies of the Church, embodying and illustrating all this story and its teaching. There is the long history of the Eucharist all down the ages, as transmuted into the experience of men. I think the process of personality influencing personality can be traced throughout.

It is perfectly clear to us all that Christ's earthly life was a constant sharing—a constant impact of His personality upon others. He came to earth not so much to give, though He gave all He possessed, still less to impose Himself—for His reverence for men prevented that—but to share all He had and was with us.

We see at once that the scene in the Upper Room was the grand climax of all this. He could not possibly express His desire to share His personality in more explicit terms than "This is my Body, my Blood. Eat this; drink ye all of it."

A man's personality expresses itself through his body; the blood is his life. Jesus invites men to assimilate all this. The words may have seemed almost cannibalistic; the suggestion

of drinking blood must at first have shocked the disciples. Yet He could not possibly have put more succinctly His offer of Himself, His whole personality. So what He had been trying to do all His life, He puts into a desperate final attempt here.

So Holy Communion becomes an epitome of Jesus: "*Tout Jesus, n'est il pas dans le dernier souper?*" All He had taught and said, all He was, He epitomizes here. It is the sacred bequest of His personality to be shared with His brethren.

Of course, I am here condensing into a sentence or two what might be spread over many pages. Holy Communion will from the beginning to the end be found to be a *speculum Christi*. Take the beginning, and take the end of His life, and see how each is being fulfilled in the Upper Room, and continues to be fulfilled in Holy Communion all down the ages. His life began with His Incarnation, the joining Divinity to humanity, the manifestation of Spirit through matter, God becoming perfect man. Clearly all this is repeated and continued by the gift of His Body and Blood under earthly symbols. So Holy Communion becomes an extension of the Incarnation. But its intimate connection with the Cross and the Atonement is equally evident. Clearly, in the latter case, the two events are one, the Upper Room is the consecration of the Victim, the Cross the immolation. Jesus said, "This is my Body which is given for you, and this is my Blood which is shed for you." He began the sacrifice, which the next day He consummated.

Were it not for this self-offering in the Upper Room, we should be without a distinct witness to the Cross being deliberate *self-sacrifice*. It might have been only a cruel murder, or a forced martyrdom, or an heroic death; but here He shows that He is offering it up of His own accord, that He may take it again quickened and transformed. So there is a vital and indissoluble and ever-recurring connection between Holy Communion and both these epoch-making events, the Incarnation and the Atonement. Holy Communion is seen as a continuation of both, as well as adequately and impressively including all Jesus was and did between the beginning and ending of His earthly career. "*Tout Jesus, n'est il pas dans le dernier souper?*"

The result we thus reach by compression, and especially by connecting Holy Communion with the two great events which started and finished His life, becomes immensely more impressive if pursued in detail. At every point Holy Communion will prove itself a mirror of the personality of Jesus. Take three or four further instances, very shortly expounded, of the way in which a great religious personality will impress himself upon others, and see how Jesus did so, and how Holy Communion reproduces and continues His work.

(a) A great religious personality will always be a *purifying power*. Jesus was always that. No one could come into contact with Him and not feel it. No one can do so now. How deeply this is imbedded in Holy Communion. How full the Upper Room was of it, and how full the service of Holy Communion is too. From the opening "Prayer for Purity," all through the Service, in the "Confession" and "Absolution," and especially in the "Prayer of Humble Access" and the "Consecration," it is all a purifying rite, a spotless personality cleansing sin-stricken and sin-soiled persons. All through He is washing our feet.

(b) A great religious personality will be a *strengthening power*. It says to men, "Be strong, O man, be strong." Jesus was always that. How? By adding His strong personality to the weakness of men and women. It was all sharing, uniting, what St. Paul calls "union with Christ." Clearly when Jesus bid His Church to eat and drink His Body and Blood, it indicated the acme of union and of consequent imparting of power. Clearly our Catechism is right when it speaks of "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ."

(c) A great religious personality will *arouse and kindle love*. No one has evoked more love than Jesus. No better school of love has ever been devised than Holy Communion, demanding and eliciting love Godward and manward. No one can draw people from their beds, while the world sleeps on Sunday mornings, as Jesus does, as His lovers wend their way, not simply to Holy Communion, not really to it at all, but to Him in it; and having reached their destination, share their eating and drinking with others, and express their mutual interests for each other by including in their prayers "the whole state of Christ's Church."

(d) A great religious personality will *incite to adventure and enterprise*. Jesus has done this better than Garibaldi or any human leader. At Holy Communion He repledges His Church each time to undertake the same great adventure He set out upon; to share His risks, His redeeming work. Surely that is involved in the Covenant (not "Testament") of His Blood, and in our consenting to eat and drink with Him, thereby pledging ourselves anew to share the breaking of our bodies and the shedding of our blood for the same end, the salvation of a lost world. A covenant means a mutual compact. As we eat and drink we commit ourselves to do our part.

These are only in an abbreviated form some instances; I am giving others more fully in my book. They show how Holy Communion rightly used can help us to share with Jesus the attributes of His personality; and how, surrendering ourselves to

Him, our personality may become transformed and reinforced by its inclusion in His larger personality.

I will shortly mention some further gains this presentation of Holy Communion brings with it.

(1) It brings us in a wonderful way right up to Reality. Reality must be the bourn of all ardent souls. Unrealities lie so thick around. How we long to move among realities! Thoughtful people in this century are thinking not only more about personality, but also more about Reality than before. Holy Communion acts as a bridge to Reality.

In the graduated scale of degrees of Reality I before referred to, the lowest is matter, the highest Spirit. Between these come Life and Mind. Now as Archbishop Temple reminds us in *Christus Veritas* "each of these grades finds its own complete or perfect development only when it is possessed by a higher grade, and each higher grade uses those which are lower than itself for its expression."

How admirably that expresses what Holy Communion does! Here is Jesus, the great Reality, because One with God, using Holy Communion, a lower Reality, to represent Him and carry on His work, and here is Holy Communion becoming dynamic because it is used and taken up by and into Jesus. So through Holy Communion we come into touch with the Reality of Jesus and of God. I have tried to go fully in my book into the relationship between Holy Communion and Reality; moreover, we must not forget that Personality itself—which we have all along been considering—is the highest form of Reality known to us.

(2) I cannot but think we have in this teaching a very moving and satisfying presentation of all we desire to express and conserve in the words "Real Presence," filling them with spiritual meaning, and safeguarding them from quasi-physical associations. Here is the personality of Christ, as both Consecrator and Consecrated. He presides over every Eucharist. His personality pervades the service. At the time of Consecration He, through His earthly minister, consecrates Bread and Wine, declaring them—as He did in the Upper Room—to be His Body and Blood, and bids us eat and drink. His personal presence is dominant throughout, and by His own ordinance the sacred elements become the focal point to convey that Presence to us.

(3) In this treatment of Holy Communion we combine the appeal to history in the past, and to the present spiritual experience of men. Christianity cannot stand on the historical tradition alone. It needs two feet, and the second is experience. It needs a present and a future faith, based on and interpreted by the past. Holy Communion cannot rest on its origin alone. We may magnify its claims on the ground of its being a "Do-

minical Institution"—though the foundations of that are not nearly so generally accepted as they were fifty or seventy years ago—but if the present experience of Holy Communion does not match its Divine claims, it will lose its hold on men. The appeal must be a double one, to its roots and to its fruits. Jesus laid chief stress on the latter. I feel sure He would rather we went to Holy Communion because of the good we find there, than because we believe He bid us do so. A thing is not right because commanded by God, but it is commanded by God because it is right.

Is Holy Communion in the experience of men, in our experience, what we claim for it? Is it to us a cleansing, strengthening, love-kindling, inciting ordinance? Or do we only say it ought to be? Unless others see it is, they will not continue to go. We are tremendously responsible. Christian missionaries in India say they are met with a threefold challenge: (1) "What you teach is not true"; (2) "What you teach is not new"; (3) "What you teach is not you."

How appallingly sad if Holy Communion becomes discredited by the inconsistencies of communicants. On the other hand, I believe it is possible to prove that for some nineteen centuries the holiest and purest souls, a multitude no man can number, of all tribes and races, black and white, rich and poor, have met Jesus in Holy Communion and thereby have been transformed into His image. In this way Holy Communion becomes not only a *speculum Christi*, but an open mirror of ourselves as well: firstly, as we are in ourselves, sin-stained and helpless, infirm of spirit, and without love or ardour; secondly, as we become "in Christ" the reverse of all this. I believe that Christian experience can be shown to be a reliable witness to all this, and tested by the most strict and searching tests, to stand unmoved. I try to show this in my later book; and that the appeal of personality matches the appeal made by the Divine origin of the rite, "What God hath joined," etc.

There are many other things to be said. I will mention two.

(a) I believe this presentation of the subject is intelligible to the "plain man," and Jesus always aimed at that. Such a lot of literature about Holy Communion is far too abstruse and high-brow for the "plain man." As Lincoln said, "God must love the common people greatly, for He has made so many of them." I plead for a simple way of approach to Holy Communion. Everyone can understand how personality can influence personality, for we are always conscious of it happening every hour among ourselves, but few can follow the metaphysical arguments, and the long-worded disputations about Holy Communion scattered freely among our Christian literature.

(b) Our Holy Communion service in a wonderful way illustrates a vital point in our religion, which is often overlooked, but which is a distinct characteristic of the personality of Jesus. I mean the way Jesus would have us approach the Father. We are often told to make our lives Christocentric; we are bidden "back to Christ"; but, after all, that is only a half-way house. As soon as we link our lives on to Christ, He attempts to pass us on to the Father. From being Christocentric, He makes them Theocentric. Is there not danger, to which Protestantism is sadly prone, of resting content with "Jesus-worship"? Should not our prayers, normally at any rate, be addressed to the Father through the Son? Anyhow, the Holy Communion service is altogether addressed to the Father. With the small exception of the threefold *Agnus Dei* in the *Gloria in Excelsis*—which is like the threefold creed—every word is addressed to the Father. It is essentially "per Jesus Christum Dominum nostrum." That is very typical of the attitude of Jesus, and of the holy care and reverence which He always manifested towards the Father. Holy Communion thus becomes a school of adoration.

I cannot conclude without mentioning one blemish, as it appears to me, in our service, and one direction in which I think it capable of improvement, and I do so for your consideration. Surely there is insufficient recognition of the work of the Holy Spirit. The 1928 Prayer Book takes a big step in remedying that lack, by introducing into the Consecration an invocation of the Holy Spirit. When our liturgies were originally composed the proper place of the Holy Spirit had not been sufficiently determined, either in theology or in the life of the Church. I cannot but hope that when we get a revised Prayer Book this will receive careful consideration, for all grace, all sacramental working, comes through Him, and it is the personality not merely or chiefly of Jesus of Nazareth, but of the "Spirit-Christ," Christ working from heaven in and through the Spirit, that we have been, or ought to have been, considering throughout. "He shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." Perhaps I am wrong in entering, at the close of my paper, upon so large and imperfectly explored a region, especially as I have only time just to make mention of it. By using the *Veni Creator* as an introit before the service commences, we can do much to remedy the want I point to, and by that means, and by a careful use of the first collect in the liturgy, be helped to keep constantly before our minds the Holy Spirit's overshadowing of all which is done and said.

D. S. GUY.

THE MEMORIAL OF THE APOSTLES ON THE APPIAN WAY

A SHORT distance outside the walls of Rome on the Appian Way stands the pilgrimage church which is now called the Basilica of St. Sebastian. This church was known in earlier times as the Basilica of the Apostles, because an ancient tradition mentioned in the Calendar of Liberius of the fourth century, in the *Liber Pontificalis* and in an inscription of Damasus, not to mention other later writings, recorded that the bodies of SS. Peter and Paul had been taken from their tombs on the Vatican and the Ostian Way and deposited in this place. When this translation took place is not quite certain, but the generally accepted opinion is that it took place in the year A.D. 258, when it was feared that the well-known tombs might be desecrated by the persecutors of the Church. This was during the period of the persecution of Valerian, who confiscated the public cemeteries of the Church and forbade all meetings for worship in them. The clergy were especially threatened: Sixtus, Bishop of Rome, and some of his Deacons, including the famous Laurence, suffered death, and so did Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. It was no wonder that the authorities of the Church should in these circumstances have sought to hide the precious relics of their Apostolic founders in what was then probably the burial place of a private house in the possession of Christian owners. Private burial places were always considered inviolate by Roman law, and it was not until the persecution of Diocletian that they were interfered with.

It is not known how long the bodies of the Apostles remained in this hiding place. Some think that they did not remain there long; others think that they were not restored to their original resting places until the Edict of Milan gave peace to the Church. Then, if not before, they were replaced in their tombs on the Vatican hill and the Ostian Way, and Constantine built over them the Basilicas, the successors of which we see today.

One thing is, however, certain: at the end of the fourth century this spot was considered to be specially holy to the memory of the Apostles, and Pope Damasus constructed a church and a cenotaph here, and set up an inscription in which he referred to this place as the dwelling place of Peter and Paul.

Hic habitasse prius sanctos cognoscere debes,
Nomina quisque Petri pariter Paulique requiris.
Discipulos oriens misit, quod sponte fatemur,
Sanguinis ob meritum, Christumque per astra secuti,
Ætherios petiere sinus regnaque piorum.
Roma suos potius meruit defendere cives.
Hæc Damasus vestras refret, nova sidera, laudes.

(The East sent the disciples, which we gladly allow. Here you must know the saints dwelt aforetime; their names, if you ask, were Peter and Paul. On account of the merit of their blood—and having followed Christ through the stars, they sought the ethereal havens and the realms of the just—Rome rather deserved to defend (or to claim) her citizens. Let Damasus thus recall your praises, ye new constellations.)

The Basilica continued to be a place of pilgrimage for many centuries, second only in importance to the actual resting places of the Apostles. As such it is mentioned in the itineraries and guide books of the Roman pilgrims all through the early Middle Ages.

It was considered a high honour to be buried there. Consequently, when the body of Quirinus, Bishop of Siscia, was brought to Rome to escape the ravages of the barbarians in Pannonia it was placed there, and so was also the body of the Roman saint, Sebastian.

In course of time the tradition about the translation of the bodies of the Apostles to the place was overshadowed by the interest that was taken in it as the actual burial place of the popular saint, Sebastian, whose intercession was considered to be powerful against the plague; and the church in common speech began to be called S. Sebastiano, as it is now. After the church had been rebuilt in the seventeenth century by Cardinal Borgese and all its ancient features hidden or swept away and the famous statue of St. Sebastian by Bernini was placed in it, the casual visitor, with no special knowledge of the antiquities of Rome, would be inclined to think that, when he had seen the statue and glanced round the church, he had exhausted its interest. If he desired to see more, he was shown a semicircular chapel behind the apse of the church, in poor condition, surrounded with sepulchral niches and with an altar standing in the middle surmounted by inferior busts of SS. Peter and Paul. Under the altar he was shown a double tomb deep in the ground which was visible through a small opening, and he was told that the bodies of Peter and Paul had once rested there. This piece of information he would probably receive with that polite incredulity with which English visitors

to the Eternal City are accustomed to regard its Christian antiquities.

If he took the trouble to look into the documentary evidence for the tradition, he would probably not find it very satisfactory, as it is far from contemporary and much overlaid with mythological details.

Nevertheless, as we have already pointed out, our supposed visitor is looking over a very remarkable place, which has not only the interesting and undoubtedly ancient features which we have mentioned, but is also notable in other ways. Near this church there is also an underground cemetery which was the only underground Christian cemetery which remained open and known all through the Middle Ages. Consequently, it was believed that all the principal martyrs of Rome had once been interred in this cemetery, and in the fifteenth century an Archbishop of Bourges and other men of the time put up inscriptions, some of which are still to be seen, stating that this was the cemetery of Callixtus, and that 174,000 martyrs were buried here, besides forty-six Popes and the famous martyr Cecilia and the virgin Lucina.

Here accordingly St. Philip Neri used to come to pray and spend whole nights in meditation, and even the discovery of many other cemeteries by Bosio and his successors did little to shake the belief of the faithful that this was one of the most sacred spots near Rome.

This particular cemetery had always borne the name of the cemetery *ad Catacumbas*, a name now generally interpreted to mean "near the tombs," or "near the low-lying ground." During the period in which it was the only one known, this descriptive denomination became used as a proper name for any subterranean cemetery, and so we now speak of them all as "Catacombs"; whereas they were never called by this name in the early ages of the Church, but rather cemeteries, crypts, hypogea, or *arenaria*.

It was not until 1850 that the discoveries of De Rossi removed all doubt that the cemetery of Callixtus was not here, but nearer Rome, on the same side of the Appian Way, and that it was in the cemetery of Callixtus, and not under the church of St. Sebastian, that the Bishops of Rome of the third century, Cecilia, Lucina, and many other famous martyrs were buried.

All this has been mentioned to show how seriously the Church of Rome is re-writing her archæological history and correcting the mistakes that the ignorant piety and exaggerations of the Middle Ages have fastened upon it. All the discoveries of De Rossi and his successors are based on careful and critical research and on scientific principles, and should not be received with

incredulity even by those who are most prejudiced against the traditions and hagiology of Rome.

To return to the semicircular chapel, to which we shall refer in future by the name "Platonia," by which it is generally called, we have seen that this must have been considered a place of particular sanctity before the end of the fourth century, and has been treated as an important piece of pilgrimage ever since.

In 1892 excavations were commenced in the Platonia with a view to discovering the early history of the place, and they have been continued at intervals until the present day. The first excavations resulted in the discovery on the wall of the Platonia of an inscription relating to the burial of St. Quirinus, to which reference has been made already.

Finally, other excavations were commenced under the church itself with a view to settling the question.

The original church was built in the fourth century, and it was customary in building churches in Rome in those days not to destroy the buildings which once occupied the site in which the church was to be built, especially if there was anything sacred about them. Consequently there was good hope that the excavations would result in the discovery of the buildings that stood on this site during the time of the persecutions—that is, during the time when the Apostles were said to have been buried in this place.

About six feet under the floor of the church a pagan columbarium of the first century was discovered, and also a wall with rough paintings of the third century representing flowers and birds. On this wall were scratched some invocations to Peter and Paul which aroused great interest. Pilgrims who came to visit the tombs of the martyrs were accustomed to scratch their names on the walls of the galleries near the sacred spot, often with some prayer to the martyr whose tomb they had come to visit.

By means of these "graffiti," as they are called in Italian, De Rossi was able to identify the position of the original graves of many of the most celebrated martyrs. These invocations to Peter and Paul therefore indicated that the wall on which they were inscribed was believed to be near their temporary resting place.

As graffiti were generally the work of uneducated persons, they are often incorrect in spelling and grammar, and this was the case with these. The most important graffiti found on the above-mentioned wall read as follows:

1. Dalmatius botum is promisit refrigerium.
2. Petrus et Paulus in men te abeatis Antonius Bassum
. . . nius e . . . in mento abete Gelasius.

3. Paule Petre in mente habete Sozomenum et tu qui legis.
4. Petro et Paulo Tomius Coelius refrigerium feci.
5. Paule et Petre petite pro Victore.
6. ΠΕΤΡ ΕΤ ΠΑΥΛΑΙ ΙΝ ΜΕΤΕ.

Translations :

1. Dalmatius promised a vow, a funeral banquet.
2. Peter and Paul have in mind Antonius Bassus, and have Gelasius in mind.
3. Peter and Paul have Sozomenos in mind, and you who read.
4. I, Tomius Coelius, made a funeral banquet to Peter and Paul.
5. Paul and Peter, pray for Victor.
6. Peter and Paul, in your mind . . .

All these graffiti correspond in form to those found in other parts of the Christian cemeteries of Rome. One is specially significant, as it refers to a "refrigerium," or solemn commemorative meal which was celebrated during the first four centuries near the tombs of the martyrs. This was a custom taken over from paganism, and, as it led to abuses, it was put down by the ecclesiastical authorities towards the end of the fourth century.

The references to the refrigerium prove that the memorial of the Apostles that existed here was not that of a house occupied by them, but of a sepulchre. The room on the wall of which these graffiti were found was evidently used as a place for funeral banquets, like the room which was discovered at the entrance to the cemetery of Domitilla, and the triclinium that exists among the ruins of the tombs at Pompeii gives us a pagan parallel.

After the discovery of the wall with the graffiti, it was considered advisable to continue the excavations under the floor of the church at a lower level. Twenty-seven feet below the floor the explorers came to a sort of rocky platform at the bottom of a natural hollow. Sepulchral chambers had been cut in the rock-walls that surrounded this hollow: one of them had the name M. Clodius Hermes cut in the lintel of the door, and was decorated with pictures of funeral banquets; it had been at first a columbarium, but had afterwards been altered to admit the burial of unburnt bodies; the others had loculi, like the Christian cemeteries. In the central chamber was a graffiti cut in the stucco consisting of the word $\iota\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$, with the letter τ between the first and second letters.

This is, of course, a Christian symbol of Christ and the Cross. In another tomb was found the following inscription, which was

shown to be Christian by the presence of a fish on one side and an anchor on the other:

Γ. ΑΝΚΩΤΙΟΣ ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΣ ΑΝΚΩΤΙΑ ΙΡΗΝΗ ΣΥΜΒΙΩ ΚΑΙ
Γ. ΑΝΚΩΤΙΟΣ ΡΟΥΦΟΣ ΚΑΙ Γ. ΑΝΚΩΤΙΟΣ ΡΟΥΦΕΙΝΟΣ
ΜΗΤΡΙ ΑΓΑΠΗΤΗ ΨΙΛΟΘΕΩ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΧΗΡΑ ΚΑΙ
ΦΙΛΑΝΔΡΩ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΤΕΚΝΩ ΜΝΕΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ.

(Gaius Ankotius Epaphroditus to his wife Ankotia Irene and Gaius Ankotius Rufus and Gaius Ankotius Rufinus to their beloved mother, a lover of God and a lover of widows [?], and a lover of her husband and a lover of her children, as a memorial.)

On the slab on which this inscription was cut there were also representations of the fish symbol and the anchor, showing that the inscription was a Christian one. These discoveries proved that this burial place belonged to a family which had once been pagan and afterwards became Christian. The great depth of the hollow also seemed to account for the name by which this district has always been known—"ad catacumbas," near the low-lying place—which name, as we have said, is now given to all underground burial places, not only in Rome, but wherever they are found.

Other excavations under the left-hand side of the church, as one looks towards the altar, led to the discovery of an ancient staircase leading from the room where the graffiti were found at an acute angle to the direction of the wall of the church in the direction of the Platonía. This staircase had been cut in two by the foundations for this wall of the church, so that the upper part of it was destroyed, but when it was uninjured it led from the room above mentioned, where the funeral banquets must have been held, into a narrow passage forty feet under the level of the present soil.

This passage led to a well-shaft which had once belonged to the Roman house existing on this site. When the well was cleared of earth, it was found that its original mouth still existed on the old ground-level, and that from that level to the level of the present church it had subsequently been built up with bricks, so that at one time it had been possible to look into it from the level of the present soil. The passage was for the most part cut in the natural rock, but in one place it was completely encircled with a band of stucco on which many graffiti had been scratched.

These were very difficult to read, because the place had been so long exposed to the action of damp, and the water rose in it when it was excavated afresh, but at last the following inscriptions were made out:

PETRE ET PAULE IMMEMTEM HABETE PRIMUM ET PRIMAM IUGALE EIUS ET SATURNINAM CONIUGEM FILI PRIMI ET VICTORINUM PATREM (ejus) IN SEMPER IN ÆTERNO ET . . .

PETRE ET PAULE IN M.

Peter and Paul have Primus in mind and Prima his wife, and Saturnina the wife of the son of Primus, and Victorinus her father in Christ, always for ever and . . .

Peter and Paul, in mind.

The second inscription was scratched very near to the floor in a very inconvenient position, which led the explorers to think it had been placed there with a purpose, possibly to be as near as possible to some sacred spot.

They therefore dug under the floor as soon as the decrease of the waters allowed them, and found a hollow cut in the rock just under the band of stucco. This measured about 4 by 2 by 2 feet.

It seems quite possible that this hollow may have been the actual temporary resting place of the bodies of the Apostles when they were taken from their tombs in 258. If the bodies were reduced to a few bones, they would naturally be placed in some kind of caskets which could easily be hidden in a hollow of the size of the one here discovered.

At any rate this supposition explains the presence of the band of stucco with its graffiti, and also the "tricila" above with its references to banquets held in memory of the Apostles.

The graffiti on the band of stucco seem to be of the fourth century, from the presence of the sacred monogram which was used instead of the fish as a sign for the name of Christ after the victory of Constantine at the Milvian bridge, when he inscribed this monogram on his standards as a result of the vision which he is said to have seen.

Professor Marucchi thinks that the recently discovered subterranean passage originally formed part of the group of tombs, situated round the natural hollow in the rock mentioned above and called "ad catacumbas."

These tombs and the house standing above them probably belonged to a family that became Christian, and allowed the bodies of the Apostles to be hidden in one of their unfinished tombs when the edicts of Valerian against the assembly of Christians in the public cemeteries threatened the safety of these precious relics, which had long been objects of veneration and pilgrimage. They would be doubly safe in such a place, being protected not only by the rights of private property, but also by the extreme reverence paid to land in which there were tombs by the provisions of Roman law. At some later

period the bodies were replaced in their original tombs on the Vatican and the Ostian Way. The place where they had lain still continued to be revered, and services of commemoration were held there. Of this fact the calendars and hymns leave no doubt whatever.

At some unknown time a room was built for the celebration of memorial feasts and the staircase constructed to lead from it to the actual place where the bodies had lain. Later on the whole area was covered by the erection of the church, and the upper part of the staircase was destroyed to make room for its foundations. Another way of reaching the place was constructed, and the gallery was lengthened until it ran into the old well of the Roman house, which had by this time been destroyed and buried under the church, together with the tombs that lay under it. The well-shaft was continued upwards to the new level of the floor of the church, that it might indicate the site of the sacred spot that lay below, and possibly serve as a means of communication with it.

Either because the presence of water rendered access to the subterranean shrine difficult, or because it was too small to accommodate those who wished to worship there, the Platonica was built at the back of the church near the head of the well. All this took place in the fourth century. Damasus put up his inscription, and the place was much visited by pilgrims and called the Church of the Apostles. As time went on the existence of the underground tomb was forgotten, as it had probably become quite inaccessible. Then the cenotaph in the Platonica took the place of the actual hiding place of the bodies in the popular imagination, and until quite lately it was shown to visitors as the actual place where they had been hidden. One curious relic of the actual history of the place, however, remained in some pictures of the removal of the bodies of the Apostles to the Catacombs which once existed in the Vatican Basilica, and of which copies are to be seen in Bosio's *Roma Sotterranea*. In these pictures the bodies are shown being put down and taken up through a well, which seems to prove that when they were painted the well-head was still visible and was connected with the story.

These discoveries are only one more proof of the folly of regarding all ancient traditions, however confused and contradictory, as of no value whatever. The spade of the archæologist has once more vindicated the basis of truth which lay behind the confused legends found in the Liber Pontificalis, the Calendar of Liberius, and the letter of Pope Gregory to the Empress Constantina, and has given us further proof of the cult of the tombs of S. Peter and S. Paul during the third century.

H. P. V. NUNN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE have received a copy of *An Alternative Form of the Calendar and Occasional Offices of the Church* (S.P.C.K., 1s.), authorized for use in the Church of South Africa where allowed by the Bishop. These Offices have already been in tentative use since 1924, and were revised in 1929; they will come up for final sanction in 1934. The slow, experimental methods adopted in South Africa appear to us to have every advantage over those which ended in this country in the semi-political scramble of 1928. The book contains several interesting features, *e.g.*, the definite distinction between Days of Fasting ("days on which no meat is taken, and the quantity of food is lessened") and Days of Abstinence ("days of self-denial either by abstinence from meat, or by some other form of self-discipline"); a Table of sixteen post-Reformation names for commemoration in Church; a form of Confession and Absolution; and a form for "The Blessing of Civil Marriage."

LAMBETH CONFERENCE REVIEW

IV.—THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

THE Church of Christ is in principle one, holy, apostolic and catholic. A particular "Church," locally situate in a particular part of the world, may receive rightly a particular local or regional designation. Epithets other than local—"denominational" designations, as applied to particular "Churches"—are a mark of division, and as such have the nature of sin. They may for the time being, so long as divisions endure, be inevitable; but the ideal—for all those who believe that the Church (*i.e.*, Christendom) ought to be visibly one fellowship—is that they should at length disappear.

The epithet "Anglican" was not in its original meaning a denominational designation. The phrase *Ecclesia Anglicana* denoted in mediæval documents simply the Church situated in England: the "Church of England" was simply the Church *in* England. The Reformation brought changes, but was not meant to involve any difference with regard to the meaning of this particular phrase. The reformed Church, as the "Church of England," claimed still to be the ancient Church of the land; in so far as it was "Anglican," it was still, as in mediæval times, "Anglican" in a local and national and not, as yet, in a "denominational," sense. Reformed, it still claimed to be "catholic"; and to its reformed doctrine and discipline it was believed and hoped that all Christians in England both could and would (with a little drastic persuasion) be induced to conform.

It was a hope destined to disappointment. A minority of "recusants" adhered still to the papal allegiance; a much larger minority

of evangelical "dissenters" in course of time became separated, for a variety of reasons, from the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and gave rise to the various nonconformist "Free Churches." The Anglican Church, neither Papist nor Puritan, despite its historic continuity with the ancient Church of the English people, came by contrast, even in England itself, to stand out as a body distinct both in doctrine and practice from others; while in relation to Christendom outside, inasmuch as it agreed neither with Rome nor with Geneva, and yet was not Lutheran, any more than it was Anabaptist, it inevitably came to present the appearance of constituting a specific differentiation within Christendom, standing as the representative of a type of Christianity at once peculiar and unique. The Church, never in principle sectarian, was yet in danger of shrinking in England into the position of an isolated, semi-Erastian, wholly insular sect.

From such a fate it was saved by its expansion outside these islands. Extended and planted abroad in the Colonies, it was eventually extended further, outside British territory altogether, by missionary effort and enterprise. It is today one of the great world-wide international communions of Christendom. To quote from the Lambeth Report, it has "come to occupy a large place in the thought of the Christian world, and provokes questionings as a world-wide institution."*

What, then, is the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, or (to give it its usual designation) the "Anglican Communion," today? To speak more particularly, in what sense is it "Anglican"? The term, in modern and current usage, tends no doubt, in some ill-defined fashion, to connote, by contrast with other current descriptions of "Churches," some kind of a "denominational" sense. Nevertheless, denominationalism is not the ideal.

The Bishops at Lambeth have seen this quite clearly. "Our ideal," they write, "is nothing less than the Catholic Church in its entirety. Viewed in its widest relations, the Anglican Communion is seen as in some sense an incident in the history of the Church Universal. It has arisen out of the situation caused by the divisions of Christendom. It has indeed been clearly blessed of God, as we thankfully acknowledge; but in its present character we believe that it is transitional, and we forecast the day when the racial and historical connections which at present characterize it will be transcended, and the life of our Communion will be merged in a larger fellowship in the Catholic Church."†

That is, indeed, admirably said; but it has to be recognized that what it means and involves is that the Anglican Church must, in the long run, cease to be Anglican. A Church which aspires after unity must be prepared to learn from all quarters of Christendom, and to be enriched, both in respect of its spiritual life and in respect of its understanding of spiritual truth, by the lessons so learnt. It must, at the same time, know how to discriminate between that which is genuinely "Catholic" (in the sense of being of universal significance) and that which is insular, accidental, or of merely local and temporary import, in its own specific inheritance. The *Nippon Sei Kokwai* or "Holy Catholic Church of Japan" (for example), or the newly autonomous "Church of India, Burmah and Ceylon," can hardly be expected to take a permanent interest in the XXXIX.

* Lambeth Conference Report, 1930, p. 153.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 153.

Articles, or to be affected in perpetuity by the accidents of English Church history, or by the limitations of the typically Anglican mind.

The Churches of the Anglican Communion are developing manifestly upon a basis of freedom. They are in no way essentially bound by the Articles—the requirements of clerical “assent” to that document, where it exists in the Church overseas, could be abolished tomorrow if the authorities of the local Church so decreed. They are not bound by the 1662 Prayer-Book—the Church possesses, indeed, in almost all provinces outside England and Wales, revised or alternative books of its own. There is, in fact, as the Bishops point out, a degree of freedom which “naturally and necessarily carries with it the risk of divergence to the point even of disruption.”*

It is true that there exist (as the Bishops also point out) in the majority of instances “racial and historical” associations and links between the parent Church and her daughters; but “already the racial bond has begun to disappear. The Churches growing up in China, Japan, India, and other parts of the world are joined to us solely by the tie of common beliefs and a common life; and the historical connection whereby they owe their existence in the first instance to Anglican missionaries is receding into the past. The future is big with further possibilities. We are today in friendly relations with Churches altogether foreign to us in race and different in traditions. Those relations may ripen; and we know not what the future has in store. It is clear to us, however, that the development of unity with them will be something other than the expansion of the Anglican Communion as we have known it.”†

All this means that the Anglican Communion, because it believes profoundly that the Church of Christ ought to be one, is beginning to aspire consciously after the ideal of its own disappearance, as a specific “denomination.” It desires, *salva libertate et integro Christi evangelio*, to be simply Christian and Catholic. It is already, in a very real degree (apart from such “racial and historical” links as are in no way essential), only “Anglican” in the sense that its constituent “Churches” are all, either directly or indirectly, daughter-Churches of Canterbury. In the event of reunion, in the full sense, being achieved with any of the “Churches” at present outside it, it is obvious that the resultant “Church” would be no longer in *any* specific sense “Anglican,” and that neither would Lambeth be the inevitable place of assembly, nor the Archbishop of Canterbury be the inevitable Chairman, of any such conferences as might be convened of its Bishops.

The Anglican Communion is at once Catholic and Evangelical and Liberal. Its constituent “Churches” (in the words of the Lambeth Report) “uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order,”‡ but they do so upon a basis of freedom. The central mind of the Church, despite all individual vagaries of doctrine and much tolerated diversity of practice, is both positive and quite sufficiently clear. “We hold,” write the Bishops, “the Catholic faith in its entirety: that is to say, the truth of Christ, contained in Holy Scripture; stated in the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds; expressed in the Sacraments of the Gospel

* *Op. cit.*, p. 154

† *Op. cit.*, p. 155.

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 55. It is noteworthy that the words which follow those just quoted are “as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common prayer as authorized in their several Churches.” There is no reference to the XXXIX. Articles as a standard of doctrine, but only to the various Prayer Books in current use.

and the rites of the Primitive Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer with its various local adaptations; and safeguarded by the historic threefold Order of the Ministry." They claim also to stand for certain "ideals," prominent among which are "an open Bible, a pastoral Priesthood, a common worship, a standard of conduct consistent with that worship, and a fearless love of truth."* Not without justification do they affirm that these ideals are (or should be) in no way specifically "Anglican," but that "they are the ideals of the Church of Christ."†

With the detailed discussion, in the second part of the Report of Committee IV., of the proper organization of the Anglican "Churches," we are not specially concerned. The importance of provincial organization is emphasized, while at the same time it is recognized that "the fundamental unit of Church organization is the territorial Diocese under the jurisdiction of one Bishop." It is held that the association of provinces or dioceses within the borders of one national territory in such a way as to constitute a "National Church" may be advantageous, but it is pointed out that a "National Church . . . must be on its guard lest the spirit of nationalism weaken its loyalty to the whole Catholic Church, lest it lend itself to unworthy political ends, and lest it expose itself to undue interference by the secular state"—a warning which may be held to be addressed, perhaps, not least to the Church of England at home.

Taken as a whole, the Report may be said to describe accurately the character of the Anglican Communion as it is coming to be, and to indicate the direction in which it is developing. The movement is definitely away from insularity and particularism, and towards a more and more wide catholicity, flexibility, and freedom. The ultimate ideal is not Anglicanism, but "the final unity of the Catholic Church." But towards that unity the Anglican Communion has a contribution to make. In particular, it stands for the ideal of a combination of catholicity with freedom, upon the basis of "apostolic doctrine and order." As against those who, in Protestant Christendom, would be content to seek merely a federation of permanently distinct and divergent "denominations," it seeks unity—the unity of a single, organic, world-wide fellowship, involving not merely a common faith, but a common order; a community, not merely of inward allegiance to Christ and of life in Him, but of ministry and sacraments, universally acknowledged throughout Christendom. As against Papalism, with its externalized claim to infallibility and its centralized government, it is content to stand (with the Orthodox Churches of the East, among others) for the doctrine of the indefectibility of the Church's life, and for the acknowledgment of the "regional autonomy" of local "Churches" within the one fellowship. This is a less cut-and-dried and less tidy, but it is also a wider, deeper, and more all-embracing, conception of unity than some others which are in vogue. It is an ideal which precludes short cuts, and the realization of which must be slow. It is, perhaps, for that very reason the more likely to be in line with the eventual working out of the purpose of God. It represents in any case a resolute attempt not to be *doctrinaire*, but to take real account both of the facts of past history and of the actual condition of Christendom (and of Christendom *considered as a whole*) in the present day. The Bishops have honestly sought, in the light of their fundamental faith in the Gospel of Christ, to look not to their own things alone, but to the things

* *Op. cit.* p. 154.

† *Ibid.*

also of others, and (while maintaining their own special witness) to discern the mind of the Spirit with respect not to the past only, but to the present, and (in so far as man's vision may apprehend it) to that eventual future in which "the things that are coming to pass" shall, in the purpose of God, find completed fulfilment.

A. E. J. RAWLINSON.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1930. Heft 1.

Nearly all the number is devoted to a very long discussion by LOHMEYER of "Sin, the flesh, and death" in Pauline theology. H. J. CADBURY has an interesting note on the use of *θεαριζω* in Heb. x. 33: hitherto reckoned a N.T. *hapax legomenon*, it has recently been found on an inscription at Jerash (Gerasa), dated 102-114 A.D. E. HIRSCH, writing on "Peter and Paul," corroborates the conclusion of recent study, that a Gentile Christianity freed from the Law had begun without Paul. A. VON HARNACK in a posthumous note calls attention to a recently discovered inscription at Rome containing the name "novatianus." It is a Gentile cognomen and has nothing to do with the Christian of that name, or with the sect called after him.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1930. Heft 2.

A. OEPKE answers a recent article by Windisch, contending that baptism of children but not of infants was the rule in the early Church. To a large extent he agrees, but recent discoveries in connection with mystery-cults suggest that baptism of infants from the side of Gentile influence, and the intensity of the belief in Adam and Christ as two inclusive forces on the Jewish-Christian side, will have led to the desire to put the child as early as possible within the sphere of the New Man, Christ. G. V. RAD connects *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας* of Luke ii. 14, "men in whom God is well pleased," with the "man greatly beloved" of Dan. x. 11. W. FOERSTER collects the patristic explanations of "thought it not robbery" (*ἀρπαγμόν*, Phil. ii. 6). Pastor ABRAMOWSKI gives the Creed of Amphilochius in Syriac and Greek. E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ compares the three stories of St. Paul's conversion in Acts with other threefold narratives, which, however, are only partial parallels.

W. K. L. C.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus XLVIII., Fasc. iii. et iv.

This number opens with an article on *L'Histoire Lausiague et Les Vies Grecques de S. Pachome*. In the Lausiatic History of Palladius we read that an angel appeared to Pachomius when he was living as a solitary in Tabennis, bade him gather together some young monks, and gave him a Rule which they were to keep. Palladius says that Pachomius obeyed the angel and founded the first cœnobitic monastic order. P. Halkin, the writer of the article, asks, "What are the historic elements contained in these two chapters of Palladius? How far can we find material in them for discovering the origins of cenobitism?" Dom Butler thinks we have in

the Rule "what is probably the most authentic summary of the most ancient monastic Christian rule." M Leipoldt sees in it "a recasting of the rules of Pachomius." M. Lefort declares without hesitation that this Rule, to which no Coptic text alludes, "is of no use or value for discovering the uses or customs of the Tabennisiot monks."

P. Halkin deals with one aspect only of this problem, namely the contention of Reitzenstein and Bousset that the Rule in question was not original, but was reproduced by Palladius from various earlier writings. P. Halkin reprints five of the earliest Greek manuscripts and submits them to a careful examination. His conclusion is that the Greek MSS. in question are more or less faithful extracts from the Lausiaca History, and that the history, therefore, is the pattern and not the copy. "Si l'on veut à tout prix, en se fiant aux intuitions de M.M. Reitzenstein et Bousset, découvrir le document vénérable qui aurait servi de source au curieux récit de Pallade, il faut se résigner à le chercher dans une autre direction."

Perhaps the most interesting article is one entitled, *La Vie Ancienne De S. Front*. St. Front, whose name is probably unfamiliar to most readers of THEOLOGY, is the patron saint of Périgord. His Life, as it appears under October 25 in the *Acta Sanctorum*, is described by P. Coens, the writer of the article, as "une légende du XIV siècle." An earlier Life, published by Bosquet in 1636, was attributed by Duchesne, who reprinted it in vol. ii. of his *Fastes Episcopaux*, to a certain Gauzbert, a tenth-century *chorepiscopus* of Limoges. Gauzbert was declared to have forged this legend at the expense of the people of Périgord.

At the Council of Limoges, 1032, "les trop jaloux défenseurs des prérogatives de S. Martial," the patron saint of Limoges, denounced this Life as a forgery and declared that the people of Périgord had paid Gauzbert for doing it. P. Coens has traced this Life back to the early ninth century, and so exonerated Gauzbert, but of the real St. Front he has only discovered that, though said to have been a contemporary of St. Peter, the first mention of him is in the Life of St. Géry of Cambrai, a work of the seventh century, in which we learn that St. Géry gave St. Front the title of Confessor, visited his tomb, and regarded him as the object of veneration.

In all the Lives there is one striking feature. A Gallic saint goes to Egypt, where he lives as a solitary and is guarded by dragons, an incident taken from the Life of Apollonius. Then he repairs to Rome, is consecrated Bishop by St. Peter and sent to Périgord, where, without any dovetailing, the author of the Life inserts a section from the Life of the Egyptian Abbot Fronto, taken almost *verbatim* from the *Vitæ Patrum*, "et nous retrouvons le désert de Nitria, sur les bords de la Dordogne." St. Front is miraculously fed by seventy camels, despatched without drivers, by the heathen governor Squirius, after he had been warned twice by an angelic vision, an incident recorded of the Egyptian Fronto. The Life ends with the baptism of Squirius, and St. Front is left, so to speak, in the air.

The number includes an article entitled *Analecta Hibernica*, on the work of the Commission on Irish Manuscripts created on October 10, 1928, by the Free State; it ends with the usual long list of interesting reviews, including a number of English books, and part ii. of vol. xxx. of the *Monumenta Germanicæ Historica Scriptorum*.

C. P. S. C.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique. October, 1930.

In the October number Father Draguet elaborates his examination of Eisler's attitude to Josephus. His judgment is that Eisler's solution is "simpliste et tendancieuse." We long to see a good book on the influence of Dionysius the Areopagite, and therefore we welcome Father Lebon's analysis of the relations of the pseudo-Denys with Severus of Antioch. Father Dhanis analyses some ancient sacramental statements with considerable power. Dom Cabrol contributes a short valuable note on the origins of the Gallican liturgy. One of the ablest examinations of the scientific career of Harnack we have read is that of Father Ghellinck; it confers distinction upon this number.

R. H. M.

The British Museum Quarterly. Vol. v., Nos. 1 and 2.

The Museum has recently been enriched by some valuable Egyptian papyri from Thebes of the XIXth and XXth Dynasties (c. 1250-1100 B.C.), the gift of Mr. and Mrs. A. Chester-Beatty. Among these is the only Dream Book as yet recovered from Ancient Egypt; also a tale recounting the Blinding of Truth by Falsehood. This tale is the earliest occurrence in literature of the introduction of allegorical personages in the form of abstract ideas. These papyri are to be edited.

Several Egyptian stelæ have lately been acquired, notably one of a "taskmaster" of the time of the XIth Dynasty. His name was Khiv, and he is described in the inscription as "overseer of prisoners."

Further objects from Ur are illustrated and described, among which is Mr. Woolley's wonderful restoration of the second goat or "ram in a thicket." This object, which is even finer than the first restored goat, now in Philadelphia, has been assigned to the British Museum.

It is good news that a reproduction of all the miniatures of the Luttrell Psalter is being prepared for a forthcoming volume, also that at least "the portrait gallery" of the Bedford Book of Hours will probably be published.

R. D. M.

Anglican Theological Review. Vol. xii., No. 6.

This number opens with an article by Dr. F. C. Grant on "The Faith of the United Church," in which he states, "As I see it, the concrete task before all those who look for redemption in Jerusalem—the restoration of the outward unity and fellowship of the Christian Church—is to enquire diligently the actual historical significance and the real present value of the Creed and Confessions of the religious bodies or communions to which they belong." The usual Anglican belief that the Apostles' and so-called Nicene Creeds are ample does not really meet the need of the United Church, because "it does nothing to help a Lutheran or a Presbyterian to solve his problems." So we are forced once more to the ultimate question, not What are our Creeds? but rather, What is the Christian Faith? H. L. Church writes on "Contemporary Tendencies in Anglican Church Music." He starts from the position that "music is brought into the offices of the Church, not to please the æsthetic senses of the refined listener, but to lift men's hearts upwards, to enable them to join with the heavenly hosts in the worship of the New Jerusalem." For this reason Church music must be different from secular music. And yet there is no

such thing as a music which is sacred and has grown up independently from secular music. "Association, and not content, causes intimations of spirituality. . . . The styles that we commonly designate as Church styles are also secular styles carried to a higher degree of refinement. These styles have survived in the Church after secular art has moved into other forms of expression. They have been made holy by the claim which the association with the liturgy inspires, after they have disappeared in the evolution of secular art." H. L. Church then considers the music actually in use today and the tendencies that can be observed. T. R. Kelly has an article, rhetorical in style, on "The Dialectic of Humanism." H. J. Flowers considers "The Vision of Revelation iv.-v.," and deals with the problem of the presence of iv. 4 in the text at all, and proposes to read, iv. 6, ἐν μέσῳ τῶν θρόνων. C. Kaplan argues for "The Pharisaic Character and the Date of the Book of Enoch." One interesting point to which, amongst others, he draws attention, in developing his argument, is that the Messiah of the Similitudes has no power to forgive sins, in contrast to Matt. ix. 2 ff. C. B. Hedrick contributes "A Reading Course on the Johannine Literature." Finally, there are thirty pages of Book Reviews and Notes.

J. O. C.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. x., No. 4.

This is a good number. We have read it through, including the first article and the reviews. Among the latter we found notice of a book,* that in suggesting the inhabitants of the Gold Coast as descendants of the "Lost Tribes" will, surely, give a shock to some of our acquaintances. We confess to reluctance at tackling the former. The title "Is Jesus Superfluous?" was repulsive. But we made the attempt, and at its conclusion reflected that the article itself was superfluous. W. C. Graham's discussion of "Religion and Human Worth" is, however, full of wisdom. That analytical attitudes to religion are inadequate; that there is no single science, natural or social, whose foundations were not laid deep and strong by the ancients; that we learn from history not to accept as axiomatic the idea that humanity is bound to progress to a better life; that psychologists are too prone to dogmatise on a very slender stock of data; that we never settle the differences between our *isms* by argumentation, but that life settles them; and that non-Christian Humanism which assumes the inevitability of human progress and the sufficiency unto himself of Man, leads only to sentimentalism, we entirely agree. From Dr. D'Irsay we learn that "a weepy mood overtook the world" of the third century, and that, while the Empire abounded in good physicians, they were not very original ones. Lactantius was a very great man, yet liable to strange judgments, as that the lower part of the nose is cartilaginous *ut ad usum digitorum possit esse tractabilis*! The "occasion" of Luke-Acts is regarded as the political situation in the time of Domitian, which prompted St. Luke to make an endeavour to obtain freedom from proscription for emerging Christianity by a frank exposition addressed to a State official. The number closes with another New Testament discussion in which the suggestion is made that ἀμαρτωλοί are the people of the land who neglect tithing, the ceremonial laws of cleansing, and the Torah. With certain exceptions where the word has clearly a moral significance, it is held to refer to a recognizable class, namely, the 'Am-hä-äretz.

H. S. M.

* *Hebrewisms of West Africa.* By J. J. Williams, S.J. (New York: Dial Press. \$7.50).

Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. Vol. vii., No. 5.

An interesting suggestion, by Professor G. B. King of Winnipeg, that *μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ* is really an injunction by our Lord to His followers that they are not to stand upon their rights, is supported by his researches into rabbinical texts. Curiously enough we find the same phrase discussed in the January *Expository Times* by a correspondent from Yale University, who suggests the translation "Resist not your wicked assailant." As between America and Canada (though Canada's *πονηρῷ* strikes us as a little odd), we prefer the latter. "Do not stand upon your rights" seems to us an admirable translation. H. S. M.

Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society. Vol. x., No. 2-3.

The greater part of this double number is taken up with a report of the Danish excavations at Shiloh during 1929. The report is from the pen of Hans Hjaer, the Director of the expedition, and is well illustrated by photographs and plans. Evidence has been obtained from these excavations that Shiloh was in existence between 1200 and 1050 B.C., and that it appears to have been destroyed by fire somewhere in the eleventh century B.C., and that after the conflagration it remained deserted for centuries. This fits in with the account in 1 Sam. iv., where we read the Israelites met with a crushing defeat at the hands of the Philistines, who captured the ark and apparently destroyed Shiloh. "Thus we see the reason why the ark of the covenant did not later return to Shiloh; the town did not exist any longer." Its destruction was certainly a disaster which impressed itself vividly on the memory of the people (*cf.* Ps. lxxviii. 60, "he forsook the tabernacle at Shiloh"; Jer. vii. 14, "therefore will I do unto the house . . . as I have done to Shiloh"; xxvi. 6, "I will make this house like Shiloh").

Perhaps the town was not completely destroyed, or a few former inhabitants may have returned to the deserted site. A hundred years later Ahijah the prophet is spoken of as "the Shilonite" (1 Kings xi. 29), and Jeroboam's wife went to Shiloh to consult Ahijah when her husband was ill (1 Kings xiv. 4).

Very interesting is the evidence of these excavations that the town rose from its ruins in Hellenistic times, about the year 300 B.C., and that it existed up to the Middle Ages. Christian Shiloh possessed two fine churches—one a basilica, the other containing some really splendid mosaics in a wonderful state of preservation. Of the mosaics we may call attention to (1) the stags eating the fruit of a tree, perhaps with reference to Ps. xlii. 1 (the catechumen desiring baptism?), and (2) the inscription in the centre of the floor of a chapel *ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσεως πορφυρίου καὶ Ἰακώβου ἀδελφ[ο]ῦ*: "For the rest of Porphyry and Jacob, a brother." The church was probably destroyed soon after the conquest of Palestine by the Arabs about A.D. 634.

The excavations are not complete. We may look for further evidence as to the importance of Shiloh through the centuries, if this field of activity is worked by M. Hans Hjaer and his competent staff of Danish investigators.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

REVIEWS

A MONUMENT TO ST. AUGUSTINE. Essays on some aspects of his thought written in commemoration of his fifteenth centenary. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

It is curious that although this *Monument to St. Augustine* is presented to the public in English, five of its essays, including the chief studies of the subject, are translations. Four of these are from the French. And seeing that these include Maurice Blondel, who has also contributed to the volume on Augustine in the *Cahiers de la nouvelle journée*; Etienne Gilson, well known for his admirable *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Augustine*; and Jacques Maritain, who represents so much in recent religious movements in France, we are set wondering whether within Roman Catholic precincts the study of St. Augustine is followed in that country rather than in this. This criticism is somewhat strengthened by recollection of Batiffol's volumes on the Saint.

The contents of the book are the following (it consists of a series of essays by ten writers): "St. Augustine and his Age," by Christopher Dawson; a sketch of his life and character, by C. C. Martindale, S.J.; "The Mysticism of St. Augustine," by E. I. Watkin; "St. Augustine and Humanism," by John Baptist Reeves, O.P.; "The Philosophy of St. Augustine," by M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.; "St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas," by Jacques Maritain; "St. Augustine's System of Morals," by Bernard Roland-Gosselin; "St. Augustine and the Modern World," by Erich Przywara, S.J.; "The Future of Augustinian Metaphysics," by Etienne Gilson; and "The Latent Resources in St. Augustine's Thought," by Maurice Blondel.

It may be useful to students to add here the contents of the new volume on St. Augustine in the *Cahiers de la nouvelle journée*, published by Bloud et Gay: Maurice Blondel, *La fécondité toujours renouvelée de la pensée Augustinienne*; Marie Comeau, *L'évolution de la sensibilité de Saint Augustin*; Jean Rimaud, *Le maître intérieur*; Jules Choix-Ray, *La perception du temps chez Saint Augustin*; Enrico Castelli, *Le double aspect du problème du mal et Saint Augustin*; Jean de Pange, *La cité de Dieu*; Charles Boyer, S.J., *La contemplation d'Ostie*.

These essays are slighter than those in the *Monument*, but useful as supplementary.

Much more on a level with the learning and solidity of the *Monument* is the volume of *Etudes sur Saint Augustin* in the

Archives de Philosophie, also published in the present year. This book contains six essays: R. Jolivet, *Le problème du mal chez Saint Augustin*; Charles Boyer, *La preuve de Dieu Augustinienne*; P. Monnot, *Essai de synthèse philosophique d'après le XI livre de la cité de Dieu*; F. Cavillera, *Saint Augustin et le livre des sentences*; B. Romeyer, *Trois problèmes de philosophie Augustinienne: à propos d'un livre récent* (this is a criticism on Etienne Gilson's Introduction); R. de Sinéty, *Saint Augustin et le transformisme*.

This volume in the Archives de Philosophie throws considerable light on the *Monument*, and certainly the two should be studied together. Personally, I have found Gilson's Introduction more illuminating than any.

In his essay in the *Monument* on the "Future of Augustinian Metaphysics," Gilson insists that we must return from the Augustinianism of the Augustinians to that of St. Augustine, a task which, he adds, is not easy. In his own Introduction Gilson declares that it is only right to say that no Augustinian has suffered so much as Augustine himself from his constitutional incapacity to organize his ideas into a regular system. The consequence is that we never clearly know whether he is speaking as a theologian or as a philosopher. The method natural to Augustinianism is digression.

It is difficult in a composite volume of essays to avoid repetition. But closer collaboration, or further editorial supervision, might have made the present work more orderly. Criticisms on the distinction between Augustine and Descartes, also between Augustine and St. Thomas, are oddly frequent. There is an almost nervous anxiety to dissociate Augustine from the former. Repeated efforts are made to bring him into association with the latter. The result is that we get too much about St. Thomas, and not enough about St. Augustine. The essays on St. Augustine and the modern world contain some quite unexpected estimates of all sorts of modern writers. Thus "Hegel and Kierkegaard denote the bankruptcy of Protestantism." J. H. Newman "prophetically anticipated the conviction, born of the fiascos of Lausanne, Stockholm, and Malines, that the Reformation cannot be overcome by negotiations of any kind." And the aim of Karl Barth is "to overcome Lutheran immanentism by an uncompromising doctrine of God's transcendence." It is explained that the Augustinianism of Hegel and Kierkegaard are sharply discordant, and that Augustine decisively overcomes "the Augustinianism of modernity." Elsewhere Maritain explains that in the term Augustinianism much ambiguity resides if it be taken to denote the idea of a system. "In this sense of the word there is no paradox in

maintaining that Augustine never professed Augustinianism. And one might ask which Augustinianism? There have been as many different, and sometimes hostile, Augustinianisms as there have been Augustinian philosophers."

In the essay on the relation between Augustinianism and Thomism Maritain observes: "How foolish to oppose Thomism and Augustinianism as two systems (I mean the Augustinianism of St. Augustine himself). The first is a system, the second is not. Thomism is the scientific state of Christian wisdom: in the case of the Fathers and St. Augustine, Christian wisdom is still a mere spring."

Gilson reiterates the same thought in discussing the future of Augustinian metaphysics. In his opinion "the principal difficulties confronting the progress of Augustinianism spring from one of its essential characteristics: its fundamental condition of incompleteness." Contrast St. Thomas. "All those who have had to teach the philosophy of St. Thomas know how little margin he leaves to the imagination of his interpreter. In expounding him, almost everything we may add of our own invention is false. Interpreting him means essentially to get to know him, to understand him: it means never, or hardly ever, to complete him. If we venture to do so, we learn sooner or later to our cost that whatever we attribute to a master like him rarely amounts to more than an average intelligent misunderstanding. Hence the remarkable stability of Thomism in the course of history."

At the same time both are indispensable. "But if we admit that a sole religion is bound to find expression in a sole magisterium, and ask what metaphysician can be regarded as the model and norm of a Catholic philosophy, whom could we choose but St. Thomas? Him and no other: not even St. Augustine." "Nothing could be more logical and even necessary than that the Catholic Church should have chosen St. Thomas as her official Doctor, but we should fly in the face of facts and of her spirit in thinking that the choice of St. Thomas meant the exclusion of St. Augustine."

On the possible dangers involved in identifying Catholicism with any particular metaphysical system nothing is said. A consciousness of those dangers may be more natural, and an independent expression of them more easy, to those outside the Roman precincts than to those within. It would be interesting to have an essay on this subject from a theologian of the Greek Church, which has neither of these products of Latin Christianity.

But as Professor Matthews, of King's College, London, says (in his recent book on *God in Christian Thought*), Thomism is a system of thought which is living and effective in the modern

world. "Even the sectarian narrowness of professional philosophers has in some measure been vanquished by the weight and enthusiasm and learning of Neo-Scholastic scholars such as M. Gilson and M. Maritain, and they have begun to admit that Thomism is a system which must be taken into account. Certainly no part of the Christian Church has any speculative doctrine of the divine nature which can be compared with the massive structure which Aquinas built on Aristotle and the Bible."

It should be added that this *Monument to St. Augustine*, however much it tends to become a monument to St. Thomas, is very ably constructed. It is essentially a work for the studious, and possesses in a very high degree the character of solidity.

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

NOTICES

RELIGION AND THE REIGN OF SCIENCE. By F. L. Cross, M.A., B.Sc.
Longmans. 4s.

Mr. Cross' modest apology for his qualifications for writing on the relations of modern science to religion is a certificate of his fitness for the task; there are few who have taken high honours in chemistry who are deep students of theology, while few great theologians have had a scientific training; nor do many of our chemists or theologians see the problems of the younger intellectual modern world from such a point of vantage as the library of the Pusey House.

What he thinks the Church wants is a new method of apologetic. If his little book, crammed as it is with summaries of the present state of the various physical sciences and accounts of the stages through which they have historically passed, could indeed be digested by many who have a misty sense that science has definitely bowed religion and all faith in the unseen out of the arena of real experience, they would have to change their attitude.

Under sure guidance they would learn how Physics, gradually emancipated from servitude to Church authority, established its reign of law, which logically left no room for miracles or free-will, but that now the rigidity of the chain of causality is questioned in the camp of physics itself; they would learn from a masterly chapter on Biology that, if the doctrine of evolution be whole-heartedly accepted, there is nothing inimical to religion in it; they would hear in the chapter on Psychology how Kant dissolved the soul, how his Subjectivism sprang from Luther, how for all their blare those who have been essaying for thirty years to subject the spirit to material tests have only run down to a bankrupt Behaviourism, and that McDougall has now reintegrated what Kant dissolved; they would follow also very sane and helpful paragraphs about "the New Psychology," and "psychic" experiment.

Then, too, we have a chapter on Philosophy, which shows how the

downfall of Hegelianism has given place to thought, however apparently hostile to Christian theology, yet really closely allied to a transcendental Scholasticism. It may be noted that in regard to the antithesis of Chalcedon Mr. Cross frankly inclines to the view that Apollinarius was right after all—humanity was, so to say, innate in the Divine Logos.

Finally, in his last chapter, experience is accepted as the ultimate authority, personal experience, of course, in its one relation to the corporate experience of the Church; then Mr. Cross frankly and contentedly sits down with Bradley and recites as his first article of faith: "The man who demands a reality more solid than the religious consciousness knows not what he seeks."

I am not quite sure that the treatment of Biblical criticism was necessary for the scope of the book; but it no doubt defines exactly the extent of the writer's Modernism.

W. J. FERRAR.

RELIGION AND THE MYSTERIOUS. By F. H. Brabant. Longmans. 4s

Mr. Brabant pleads guilty in his preface to "breathing concentrated Otto," and "chasing many hares started by his *Idea of the Holy*"; but he keeps his head, as a student of Browning should, and dissociates himself decidedly from the antics of the metaphorical hound, when he considers the attitude of our Lord to the Heavenly Father; and that is the main point: Otto's *mysterium tremendum* is not the Father revealed in Christ.

However, the *Idea of the Holy* has switched our minds today on to the mysterious side of religion, and happily rescued us from the platitudes of a religion too well understood; moreover, it has dispatched thinkers like Mr. Brabant on an interesting quest of definition. After all, what do we mean by mystery? In our everyday conceptions first? In the Bible and in Church teaching? In our own religious experience? What connection has the conception of the Mysterious with that of Curiosity, of Wonder, of the Sublime? And coming to religion, is it of the essence? and, if it is an essential element, how much of it is to be desired in proportion to that other thing with which religion is concerned—the knowledge of Truth? The writer, touching many side issues as he travels, and recalling many apt illustrations from the great religious minds, comes to most sane and inevitable, if not strikingly original, results. "A mysterious fact must be something between the known and the unknown. But a half-understood truth is not a mystery, nor is the twilight of a vacant mind." Understanding and adoration are both God-implanted, and they must work together, and "the Catholic Church ought to find room for the fullest and freest enquiry."

Whatever our own particular bias—whether towards Mystery or Knowledge—this unpretentious little book will prove interesting. Mr. Brabant's charm is his tone of frank and reverent enquiry: his reader has the feeling of being quietly deposited in an Oxford chair one side of the fireplace, while his host, dimly descried in the depths of another on the other side, just frankly thinks aloud, or socratically examines the grounds of his guest's conventional ideas.

W. J. FERRAR.

THE TESTAMENT OF PAUL. Studies in Doctrine Born of Evangelical Experience. By J. Ernest Rattenbury. The Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Rattenbury's book fulfils the promise of its title. He gives us an interpretation of St. Paul in the light of that type of Christian experience which is represented by Methodism. He has special qualifications for the task. For St. Paul is a conspicuous example of that sudden conversion which Methodism tends to regard as normal. There is a general agreement today that St. Paul was not primarily a systematic theologian. If we are to understand his meaning, we must enter into the personal experience of a living Saviour that lies behind his writings. The present volume will be found by many of real assistance to this end. Dr. Rattenbury combines missionary experience with a wide study of the most recent books about St. Paul. Preachers will find much valuable material, especially in the earlier chapters. His treatment of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is specially attractive (pp. 175 ff.). In all his descriptions of St. Paul's religion it is refreshing to find the constant stress upon the reality of the supernatural, without which the experience is meaningless. Our chief complaint is that certain statements seem to leave no place for the "once-born" in Christianity. Is the experience of St. Paul the only possible Christian experience?

The last two parts of the book are less successful. Much that is said about Christian unity is true, but we are bound to insist that no satisfactory treatment of this problem is possible so long as we confine ourselves to the inward experiences of Christians. Other factors must come in. Perhaps it is here that we meet the limitations of Methodism. Nor are we satisfied with the brief treatment of the question of the validity of religious experience. It is impossible in the space given to the subject to expect an adequate discussion of the many problems that are involved. Nothing specially new is said, and the book would be stronger without the last two chapters. But we are grateful for this contribution to a fuller understanding of St. Paul, even if we hold that other types of Christian experience have an equally important contribution to make. We hope that the book will have a large circulation among non-Methodists.

E. J. BICKNELL.

NEW METHODS IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

THE CONFIRMATION SCHOOL. By A. R. Browne-Wilkinson. 2s.

THE SIGN OF FAITH. By Philip Carrington. 1s. Published by the St. Christopher Press and S.P.C.K.

For those who are responsible for the religious teaching of children in Sunday Schools the situation created by the modern method in secular education of dividing children into the three groups—Infant, Junior, and Seniors (eleven to fifteen years of age)—must be seriously faced. The senior children are being definitely separated from the others not merely by class rearrangement, but by attending different schools. The Church must do something of the same kind, as it is obviously asking for trouble to try to mix on Sundays those who are apart by reason of age on weekdays.

Mr. Browne-Wilkinson's book deals exclusively with the treatment of

children of the eleven plus age. The solution he propounds is the establishment of a Confirmation School which, in the direction of instruction, is to bear a close relationship to the ancient catechumenate for Baptism. The scope will be wide and train children in a Christian way of living by three strands—regular Sunday worship, instruction, and social activity and service. This last will be accomplished by organizations already existing in most parishes—*e.g.*, Scouts, Guides, etc.

The course of instruction is worked out on a four years' basis, and during this period the child will be confirmed at the age agreed upon by the parents and priest. That is to say, that the period of the school will include Confirmation, though not end with it.

The Catechism is to be the basis of a wide and exhaustive scheme of instruction. This will enable the priest to devote himself in the more intensive Confirmation classes wholly to devotional and moral teaching, and save him from the vain effort of striving in a few lessons to cram into the children an outline of the whole Christian Faith.

The teaching is to be given strictly according to modern scientific methods, allowing ample opportunity for "research" or self-expression. On Sundays attendance at an early Eucharist is urged where possible, to accustom the children to the idea of regular Communion. The Confirmation School is to be closely associated with the parish priest, and regarded essentially as his school, even when he does not actually give the instruction. A recommendation that the school should be divided into terms, with holidays intervening, is a most welcome one. Members, it is contended, will be held together by meeting on Sunday for worship and on weekdays for social purposes.

The whole book is a stimulating one and a valuable contribution towards the settlement of an admittedly perplexing problem. Like all reforms it has its difficulties. The provision of teachers adequately equipped to meet the new demands is the most serious. One doubts whether any of the present means, such as training week and tutorial correspondence classes, will be able to fit the teacher for the big task. If the afternoons are to be left free and the teaching given on Sunday mornings, the clergy in most cases will be ruled out as instructors. A third question is whether it is possible to associate in the same class, or even in the same school, children who have been confirmed with those who have not.* There is a deep-seated sense of finality in the young mind connected with Confirmation—a feeling of self-importance which is not wholly unhealthy.

But whatever the difficulties, the book should be read and studied by everyone who has the responsibility of the religious education of the young.

The importance of *The Sign of Faith* is out of all proportion to its size. It is the first of a trilogy entitled "A Little Outline of Christianity," and is intended to be placed in the hands of boys and girls. The Faith is presented in heroic form to show the Christian life as one of love, strength, and beauty lived by the help of divine grace.

In a way it is an echo from Canada, where the author is a Professor

* With regard to our reviewer's last point, we have found by experience in the last year that both our boys and girls of thirteen plus are quite prepared to spend a year after Confirmation in the "Confirmation School." We adopted the plan as the result of a conversation with Mr. Browne-Wilkinson, and so far it has worked.—ED.

of Divinity, of Mr. Browne-Wilkinson's contention in his *Confirmation School* that the primary function of Sunday School teaching, or religious teaching generally, is not to impart Biblical and doctrinal knowledge. It is to reveal the Christian religion as a way of life, and to assist children to realize and live their churchmanship while they are yet in childhood. Most teachers, both clerical and lay, are apt to point forward to the times when their pupils *will be* churchmen and churchwomen. How much better and wiser it is to emphasize that they are already living members of the Church, and to devise means whereby they can give full expression to their membership now. Professor Carrington's method, although the book has great value apart from it, is by a Religious Order for children known as "the Order of the Soldiers of the Cross." But where children's organizations already exist, he does not stress "the Order." The book contains much useful information, plentifully illustrated, of a kind not generally to be found in books of the same class.

C. C. H. JAMES.

THE GOOD ESTATE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Viscount Halifax. Longmans. 1s. 6d.

The writer describes this little book as a "paper," and adds that it will be the last of its kind that he will ever write. Actually it is a series of eleven papers, varying in length, arranged as chapters. The general contention is for a recognition of the "extreme" Anglo-Catholic, not merely as a loyal member of the Anglican Church, but as the only true and loyal exponent of her doctrines and ceremonies. To prove this a chapter is devoted to the "King's Book" of Henry VIII.'s reign, which obtained the sanction of the provincial synods and the royal assent; it is therefore to be accepted as the authoritative teaching of the Church. The obvious difficulty for Lord Halifax in using this document is that the rejection of the papal claims to universal jurisdiction is as emphatic as the constructive explanation of the seven sacraments and "the laudable ceremonies" of the Church.

To the end he declines to see that the attitude of the left wing of Anglo-Catholicism towards the papacy is very far from being representative of that of the whole English Church. The other subjects dealt with are "A Post-Reformation Summary," "The Doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament," "The Prayer Book of 1549," "England and Rome," "Reunion and the South Indian Proposals"; the last is very brief and written before the Lambeth Conference.

After more than two generations of incessant strife for his cause, Lord Halifax can write his literary "vale" full of hope for the future. This hope is accompanied by strong faith and great charity. And so perhaps the spirit in which the book is written is its strongest argument; for that, at least, is undebatable.

C. C. H. JAMES.

THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST: DEATH AND JUDGMENT: THE HOLY GHOST. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1s. paper, 2s. cloth.

Three new volumes of "The Treasury of the Faith" series have considerable intrinsic merits, but from the standpoint of this journal it is perhaps more useful to comment on positions from which Catholic-minded Anglicans are likely to dissent. Dr. Smith on the Eucharist is helpful.

Generally speaking, we should express ourselves much the same if it were not for the fact that we think on such different lines. It is reassuring to read that "any philosophy may be reconciled with the dogma of transubstantiation which safeguards the distinction between 'the appearances' of a thing and the thing itself." But when we are told that St. Thomas' explanation of an obvious difficulty is now accepted—after consecration the substance of the elements disappears, but God miraculously empowers the *quantity* of the elements to play the part usually played by the substance—we wonder why it is necessary to formulate definitions from which such escape is necessary; the explanation itself is admirable, granted the need for it. Again, the Real Presence is said to last for ten minutes, but the union with Christ effected by His Presence may be continuous. We see no reason to distinguish between the two.

Abbot Vonier's study of Death and Judgment is intensely interesting from its contrast to the things generally believed by Anglicans. Death is a punishment, since God intended all men to possess an immortal bodily frame, by means of His special gift. This thesis may linger on in homiletics; it is no longer seriously stated in our theology. The Abbot lays great stress on the loss of the body at death. The disembodied soul can hardly be called a human person; it is a maimed being, deprived of human personality. "We can only think of [our dead] by clothing them in our imagination with a humanity which is not theirs any longer, but will be theirs again when death is overcome by Christ." The disembodied soul dying in a state of grace turns to God wholly; it is pure spirit. The Abbot rejects the purifying effect of Purgatory, the purpose of which is purely penal. We note also that no Catholic can doubt the literal destruction of the physical world through fire.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

MYSTICISM. By Evelyn Underhill. New edition. Methuen. 15s.

The appearance of a revised edition of Evelyn Underhill's *Mysticism* is a cause of great satisfaction. For it means that the book has taken, as it richly deserved, a permanent place amongst our theological literature, and not been drowned, as might so easily have happened, in the flood of temporary and occasional books which have issued from the press during the twenty years which have elapsed since its first publication. It justly deserves the position which is thus made evident. For it is comprehensive without being overloaded, and gives the necessary conspectus which is required by those who are interested in religion itself, as distinct from, and fundamental to, its implications in dogma and discipline. Those of us who are endeavouring to understand ourselves and our perceptions need the more sharply defined experiences of those who have felt more deeply and realized more explicitly. Great as is the gap between the first-class mystic and the ordinary person, yet the precision of the former serves to give definition to the perceptions of the latter. No doubt we might secure the assistance of the great mystics by studying their works extensively at first hand. In any case, we should need the guidance which Miss Underhill affords us. But, apart from this, their books are not easy to study. Each writer has had to devise a language in which to express himself. And few people have the faculty of grasping idioms which are so varied. Most of us need translations into a speech more nearly resembling our own, and elucidations, even if they be only elucida-

tions by selection. This Miss Underhill gave us, and her gift retains all its practical value to this day.

It was perhaps necessary for the production of a right impression, but we venture to think that Miss Underhill's insistence on the distance and difference of the completely developed mystic from the ordinary Christian seems to be a little dangerous and misleading. After all, if the message of the book be true, the great mystics display the goal towards which we are all drawn. And, as a matter of actual practice, the effect of this book has been, not to give us a distant view of a small and privileged class, but to stimulate very ordinary people and to make them value impressions and longings which, otherwise, might have vanished unnoticed and unvalued. Miss Underhill says, in one place, "we who are not mystics." The effect of the book has been to make many of us feel that we ought to be mystics, and would be such if we persevered. And we cannot believe that one who understands, as Miss Underhill does, is outside the class of mystics. Indeed, one of the great values of the book consists in the pregnant and illuminating remarks which she herself makes. We urge this point, because the book, useful as it is to specialists, ought to have a wider currency. Apart from the fact that the evidence of the great mystics has lately taken on a new importance, the plain man is beginning to realize that religion is not a tradition of things past or a promise of things future, but a life to be lived now, and he needs the illumination and stimulus which this book gives. He needs to know that the word mysticism is only the technical name for the belief, the verified belief, that God is knowable. And we know no book that sets forth the belief and its grounds more clearly and attractively.

Is it too late to hope that Miss Underhill's references to Recejac's great book may at length bring that lucid and profound work into the vogue which it so richly deserves?

R. O. P. TAYLOR.

MAN AND HIS RELIGION: AN ESSAY IN THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS, ANCIENT AND MODERN. By S. P. T. Prideaux. Williams and Norgate. 10s.

A vast amount of diligent research has gone to the making of this book. The first part does really present, as it claims to present, a "general survey" and discussion of the principal observances and doctrines of all known religions—a remarkable *tour de force*. Nothing of importance seems to be omitted, and an interesting feature is the way in which the author illustrates his description of unfamiliar facts by parallels in English tradition and folklore: thus, for example, the "general reader" (for whom, rather than the student, the book is evidently intended) may learn for the first time the original ideas underlying hot-cross buns (and the meaning of the word "bun" itself), the expression "gone West," such words as "hocus-pocus" and "patter," martingales, and the acorn-shaped knobs often found at the end of blind-cords. Dr. Prideaux's method has inevitably some of the defects of its qualities: there is here and there an appearance of sketchiness; the attention given to some important subjects is hardly adequate, even in a book of this size; and the documentation (particularly in the first part) might well have been much fuller. The second part discusses the inferences to be drawn from the results of a comparative study which includes Christianity; and the orthodox Christian

interpretation of the facts is well summarized. A curious omission in a work which covers so much ground is that there is no reference to the modern atheistic psychologist's explanation of the facts in terms of "projection," etc. We commend the book warmly to all who wish for a comprehensive introduction, from a Christian point of view, to a fascinating subject.

C. E. HUDSON.

TWO WITNESSES. By Gwendolen Greene. Dent. 7s. 6d.

Mrs. Plunket Greene intended, in this book, to pay tributes to the memories of her father, Sir Hubert Parry, and her uncle, Baron Friedrich von Hügel. They were both heroes in her eyes, and she lavishes praise upon them bravely.

In the case of Sir Hubert Parry, the result is by no means what his daughter intended. Though she catalogues his qualities and his virtues, she does not thereby paint the portrait of the man. We get the picture from side glimpses, and it turns out to be that of a complete domestic tyrant, such as Samuel Butler would have loved to pillory. The devoted daughter means to hide the fact, but the truth will out. In the Parry family there was only one egg for breakfast, and that was eaten by papa. His right to do so was unquestioned. Little Gwendolen spent most of her childhood in disgrace. "Ebullitions of animal spirits," she writes, "were much disapproved of by my father, and I was always severely reprov'd for them." Evidently papa would rather have his little girl sobbing alone on the box-room floor than racing round and round the garden in an ecstasy of *joie de vivre*. He took her sailing with him "often hungry and cold," and riding even when she was too sick to sit in the saddle. "There are certain Sussex ridges where I can feel vividly, even now, the misery I suffered over them, galloping after him with my head beating at every stride of my horse as if it would burst, myself in tears."

One wonders, turning these pages, to what truths or principles this gentleman was supposed to witness. The wrapper of the book says "to the truth of religion." But Parry is represented as an agnostic, with a violent prejudice against organized religion. He must have witnessed to the truth of the legend concerning the well-meaning stupidity and cruelty of the Victorian father.

Far more attractive is the picture of the serene and saintly Baron von Hügel. His deafness, which cut him off, to a great extent, from ordinary society, opened his ears to heavenly wisdom. He communed with God, he pondered, he understood. It was owing to his influence that Gwendolen's tormented soul attained to peace, and that she found her spiritual home in the Roman Catholic Church. She believed that Anglicanism could offer her nothing but the externals of religion, and, by a curious misunderstanding, thought that mystical experience was impossible for anyone remaining in its fold.

The book is chiefly interesting for the lovable character of the writer herself. Some tedious pages of moralizing might, however, with advantage have been omitted.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

BOOK OF EXERCISES FOR THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By Abbot Garcia de Cisneros, O.S.B. Translated from the Spanish by E. Allison Peers. Monastery of Montserrat. 5s.

One of the most important contributions within recent years to the history of mysticism is Professor Allison Peers' *Studies of the Spanish Mystics*. But though the book is a stout volume of nearly 500 large pages, it by no means satisfies the interest and curiosity that it arouses. The sketches which Professor Peers gives of seven representative mystics of the Spanish golden age, together with quotations from their works, do little more than indicate what treasures, both from the point of view of literature and of religion, await the student. Many of the problems which the book raises are exceedingly interesting. Among these may be mentioned the question of St. Ignatius' famous *Spiritual Exercises*. Were these original or were they based upon an earlier work, or works?

In setting out to answer the question, it must be borne in mind that in the sixteenth century and those times no prejudice existed against plagiarism. If an author wrote down his own thoughts he was admired for his originality. If he calmly annexed the words of other writers without acknowledging their source he was, when found out, admired for his learning. It did not matter much either way, provided that the work was edifying. St. Ignatius may have been a plagiarist, and yet an honourable man.

What are the facts? In the year 1500 a Spanish Benedictine monk, Francisco Garcia de Cisneros, wrote a book entitled *Ejercitatorio de la Vida Espiritual*, which was published in both Spanish and Latin. He was Abbot of Montserrat until his death in 1510, and ruled his monastery with zeal and discretion. His *Spiritual Exercises*, written for the contemplatives of the community, became known to the pilgrims who visited the shrine of Our Lady of Montserrat.

In 1522 St. Ignatius was at the monastery. The book must have been put into his hands for devotional use. There seems to be little doubt that he actually practised the meditations, and, in the light of the religious experiences which they produced, wrote his own more celebrated *Exercises*.

Professor Peers has now translated the Abbot's work into clear and readable English, following the Spanish edition of 1912, which is actually in use at the monastery. The student may now compare it with St. Ignatius' *Exercises*. The resemblances are many, but the work of the Jesuit will be found vastly superior in vividness, in imagination, and in power. Wherever St. Ignatius may have found his material, he moulded it into a shape, and breathed into it an ardent spirit all his own. The Abbot's book, however, is well worth reading for its own sake, being full of wise counsel and much practical common sense in the direction of souls.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE WAY OF A PILGRIM. Translated from the Russian by R. M. French. Philip Allan. 4s. 6d.

This work is a little gem. Anyone who loved the spirit of "Holy Russia" as it was before the Bolsheviks brought desolation on the land should get and treasure this volume. The name of the author is unknown. The manuscript was lying unnoticed at one of the Russian monasteries

on Mount Athos, when it was discovered by an Abbot from Kazan, who had gone there on a pilgrimage. Struck by the unique charm of the work, he copied it with his own hand, and had it printed at Kazan in 1884. The manuscript itself is not old, and was probably written about 1853. The writer was a peasant from the government of Orel. Having been crippled through the spite of his only brother, who pushed him off the top of the stove where they slept, and being unable to work, he learned to read and write. The Bible was his spelling-book, and it lit in his heart a desire to know God. The precept which fired his imagination was the injunction "Pray without ceasing," and he felt he should never be happy until he learned how this might be accomplished. He wandered from place to place seeking instruction, but neither sermons nor teachers were able to give it to him. At last he met a monk who taught him what he called "the Prayer of Jesus," the uninterrupted repetition of the phrase "Lord Jesus Christ, have mercy on me," to be accompanied by a mental picture of the Lord. The pilgrim followed the instructions of his director, and by diligently pursuing the curious practice, found the peace that he desired. He roamed up and down Russia, in dire poverty, but full of joy, teaching his prayer to any man or woman fit to receive it. He carried with him two books—the Bible and the *Philokalia*, containing passages from the great saints of the Eastern Church. These were his sufficient spiritual food.

Finally he set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and the book closes abruptly, unfinished.

Such a volume might well be called the "Mirror of a Simple Soul," for it gives a perfect picture of the inner life of a childlike and loving heart, who was unconscious of the beauty of character that he revealed. It mirrors, too, the Russian countryside; the wide lonely steppe; the forests of birch trees; the villages with their wide streets and one-storied huts; the whitewashed domed churches, from behind which run out little children who catch the beggar by the hand and beg him to come to their home, where their mother makes all beggars and pilgrims welcome.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE CHESTER MIRACLE PLAYS. Done into Modern English and arranged for acting by I. and O. Bolton King. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This is an interesting attempt to bring the old miracle plays performed by the Guilds, in the Chester Cycle, into the sphere of religious play-acting today.

Comparing this text with the originals, one wonders rather why the translators took certain liberties; one feels that they could have been more faithful to their originals without obscuring their modern version too much. Still, on the whole, it is a workmanlike translation, and gives the sense and feeling of the older versions very well. The plays of the Childhood of Man and of the Nativity are likely to be the most popular. It is difficult to see how the Passion plays could be convincing under the present regulations of the Lord Chamberlain.

Sir Barry Jackson, in his introduction, compares these plays to *Green Pastures*; but there is a dignity and repose among the humour and naïveté of these fourteenth-century plays which is not very suggestive of the negro approach to religion, which has its own virtues.

It would be well worth while for those who are working at religious drama to try out these plays, and learn from the mediæval dramatist his unaffected, unforced grasp of spiritual things.

MARGARET CROPPER.

ESSENTIALS. By P. Carnegie Simpson. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s.

Anyone who wishes to be a little wiser and better than he is should read this book. Dr. Carnegie Simpson is too well-bred to talk about himself, but he draws on the riches of his own experience to tell us what are the really important things in life. He is well qualified for the work. A man first, and a theologian afterwards; a husband, father, and grandfather; a high dignitary of his own Church and a mediator between that Church and others; the friend of many men and women, distinguished and obscure, young and old, in Cambridge and elsewhere. He is the kind of person to whom strangers confide their life-histories in railway carriages. And he prides himself on never taking a holiday without seeing the world from a different point of view.

What, then, does Dr. Simpson consider the essentials? They are *inward* and they are *few*. We must have *something to do* and *someone to love*. We must be moral, not because a morality is imposed on us from outside, but because we are spiritual beings, and for our own sakes should not thwart or cramp our nature. Moreover, bad actions are "a breach of faith with the community of mankind."

Dr. Simpson pleads for a *balanced* view of life, and boldly includes a sense of humour among his essentials. Love of nature and of art, and above all friendship, are the great beautifiers of existence. In a particularly fine passage he reminds us that we cannot ignore the fact of Jesus, even if we consider Him as Mr. Middleton Murry does, merely "the most striking and significant variation from the norm of the *homo sapiens*."

The loveliest chapter is that on old age, but the whole book should be read eagerly—even by the young, for whom, as the author slyly assures us, it is not intended.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.